மகாமகோபாத்தியாய
டாக்டர் உ. வே. சாமிநாதையர்
நூல் நிலையம்,
சென்னை-600090.

THE LIGHT OF TRUTH

— OR —

SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA.

A Monthly Journal, Devoted to Religion, Philosophy, Literature, Science, &c.,

***Commenced on the Queen's Commemoration Day*, 1897.**

VOL. IV. } **MADRAS, JULY 1900.** } **No. 2.**

Table of Contents.

PAGES.

Translations—

The Vedànta-Sùtras with Srikantha Bhàshya
by A. MAHADEVA SASTRI, B.A. 25

Sivagnana Siddhiar of Arul Nanthi Siva Chariar
by J. M. NALLASWAMI PILLAI, B.A. B.L., ... 30

A Hymn from Devaram
by N. BALASUBRAMANIAN M.A. 33

Pre-eminence of Tamil
by ALKONDAVILLE G. 34

PAGES.

Articles—

The Problem of Evil No. III
by ALKONDAVILLI G. 35

Kampanology
by C. BRITO 37

Nacchinarkkiniyàr
by S. ANAVARATAVINAYAKAM PILLAI, M.A.... ... 39

A library of Advaita Works 46

Extracts 48

SUBSCRIPTIONS:—Advance Rate Rs. 4 per annum. Arrears Rate Rs. 6 per annum.
SINGLE COPY 8 ANNAS.

☞ IMPORTANT NOTICE:—All remittances, communications, and exchanges, &c., must be addressed to THE PUBLISHER, "*Siddhanta Deepika,*" Black Town, Madras.

The following is a true copy of the valuable circular on Sanitation recently issued by Mr. C. V. Swaminathaiyar, Editor of the *Viveka Chintamani*, along with his journal. It is the first of a series of circulars on the subject to be followed up in future from time to time.

Sir,—I have just returned to Madras after making a week's stay in Coimbatore, where I have been busy endeavouring to interest officials and members of Local Boards and Municipal councils in the sanitation movement now being started under the auspices of some of the best country lovers of both among Europeans and Indians.* I interviewed most of the District officials, from the Collector downwards, and many of the leading men in Coimbatore, all of whom received me kindly and gave a sympathetic hearing to my proposals in connection with spreading a knowledge of the elementary principles of sanitation among the people at large, and promised their co-operation to a certain extent. By kind invitation of the President, Coimpatore Taluq Board—who, by the bye, is in entire sympathy with the new movement I addressed a meeting of the members of that Board on Monday last, the 15th instant, and urged on the members the necessity of taking active steps in enlightening the people on sanitary matters and was fortunate euough to enlist their active sympathy for the movement. The Provincial Social Conference has also passed a Resolution on the subject, recognising the necessity of making special efforts, to enlighten the people on the elementary principles of sanitation. I append below a short appeal on the subject, which, I trust, will receive your earnest attention and favourable response.

APPEAL.

Writing in July, 1898, on the subject of educating the masses in sanitary matters, in reply to an editorial note on the subject that appeared in the *Madras Mail*, I related a bit of my own experience and concluded as follows :—

"What is wanted is an awakening of the masses to a consciousness of the evils that surround them every moment of their life owing to their living under insanitary conditions. The best way to do this under the present circumstances is by the wide circulation of useful tracts and by frequent lectures. The latter cource, if adopted and worked by a central organisation on a large scale and in a systematic way, would produce much beneficial result; but it would require such a large command of resources in men, money and brains, that it is impossible to think of any feasible scheme in the near future. The former course appears to me a little more feasible, and a begining at least could be made if only the educted people, including officials, would stand up and stretch out a helping hand. The Diffusion of Knowledge Agency is prepared to issue useful tracts on sanitation and public health, and other kindred matters, if some of our leading men who talk big on public occasions will give it a little help and support—not mere lip support, as they are wont to give in plently, but a little substantial help and support in hard cash or harder work. The Local Boards and Unions can do much by purchasing these tracts and distributing them among the people through the agency of schoolmasters, overseers, and others interested in the work. Dr. King quite approved of the feasibility of this idea; but the difficulty is that no idea, however feasible and good, takes practical shape in this country, unless brought out under the ægis of direct official support and countenance: and such countenance and support it is hard to obtain for an unpretentious agency, under existing circumstances."

It is proposed to publish regularly every month in the *Viveaka Chintamani* a series of easy papers on sanitation and allied subjects and to issue them afterwards separately in the form of tracts, which will be available at a moderate price for distribution among people by Local and Municipal Boards and Unions whose willing co-operation will form an essential condition of success for such a movement—by private persons and philanthropists and all others who are interested in the progress of sanitary ideas among the people.

The principle relied on for working the movement is that of utilising voluntary efforts and willing co-operation for public good by individual members of society; and if our endeavour to organise a voluntary Association of Helpers proves successful, it is proposed to organise a system of popular lectures in villages.

Besides what the Government can do and actually does by Acts and Regulations to promote village sanitation "there are other agencies from which much may be expected." The first of these is to quote from the Government of India's Blue Book on village sanitation in India "the constant pressure of the Government officials, both as advisers of the people and in their Magisterial and executive capacity. There is no doubt they can do immense good by visiting the villages and impressing on the villagers the necessity of improved sanitation." The second, as ably urged by the veteran Miss Nightingale, "is the influence of the educated classes as missionaries of sanitary reform. There can be no better work for the educated class to undertake," and it is hoped "they will see the necessity of it."

I now appeal to all educated persons in general and to Presidents and Members of Local and Municipal Boards and Unions, and to Government officials in particular, who wield an immense influence for good over the people in this country, to lend their aid and co-operation to this movement and help to further the cause of sanitary reform by enlightening the people on matters that most vitally affect their well-being in every day life.

C. V. Swaminathaiyar,

Triplicane, May 1899. *Secy. D. K. Agency.*

* The following is a list of persons who have up to date consented to lend the weight and influence of their names and their active interest in furthering the movement.

Lieut-Col. W. G. King, M. B., C. M., D. P. H, C. I. E., I. M. S.
The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Subramania Iyer, C. I. E,
H. O. D. Harding, Esq., I. C. S.
M. R. Ry. R. V. Srinivasiar Avgl., Dewan Bahadur.
" V. T. Vedadrisadasa Moodr. Avgl., Retired Judge.
" H. Subraya Aiyer Avgl., Retired Dy. Collector.
" A. C. Pranaharthihara Iyer Avgl., Asst. Inspector of Schools.
E. W. Legh, Esq., I. C. S.
M. R. Ry. T. S. Balakrishna Iyer Avgl., Public Prosecutor.
Dr. P. S. Chandrasekara Iyer M. B., C. M.
Dr. C. B. Rama Rao, L. M. & S.
Rao Bahadur C. Nagoji Rao Avl., Inspector of Schools.

The following letter addresed by Mr. L. C. Innes F. M. U, a retired Judge of the Madras High Court on "The Vernaculars" to Mr. C. V. Swaminatha Ayar, Secretary to the Diffusion of Knowledge Agency may be of interest to the readers of our Review.

"I feel very much obliged to you for sending me your excellent paper on the encourgement of the vernaculars. The state of things disclosed is disheartening, as it is clear that the efforts that have been made by the several Universities have failed to bring about any improvement in the promotion of greater taste of vernacular literature, or of more extensive adoption of the vernacular as a medium for education and enlightment of the masses. It seems to me that very little can be done by the University through any change in the course of studies, whether by placing the vernaculars on a par with English or otherwise. More may be effected by reforming *school* education so as to enable the young student to receive a good grounding in his own vernacular through the medium of vernacular text-books. But even this will be of comparatively little use unless there is a good supply forthcoming of attractive literature for the young. Original Tamil literature of such a pure and harmless character as would alone be suitable would not, I take it, be sufficiently attractive to young people; and the transfusion of western literature into the vernaculars of India proceeds but slowly, and very little of it is, in its nature, likely *to* attract the young. To effect its object, the literature so turned into the vernacular must be amusing and instructive. As Mr. M. Shama Rao, M. A., of the Mysore Educational Department, intimates in the passage you have quoted from him at page 17 of your paper, the supply of such literature may be expected to create the demand, and when the demand is once created, the supply will still further promote it. For the more advanced your magazine and kindred works strike me as best adapted to keep up the taste once acquired by the young for vernacular literature. The University might do somewhat in the way of encouraging the vernaculars by offering prizes for vernacular essays. I am very glad you are taking up the subject and wish you every success. It is imposible that the proper instruction and enlightment of a people should be effected except through the medium of its own special vehicle of thought."

டாக்டர். உ. வே. சாமிநாதையர்
நூல் நிலையம்,
சென்னை-600090.

THE LIGHT OF TRUTH

— OR —

SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA.

A Monthly Journal, Devoted to Religion, Philosophy, Literature, Science, &c.,

Commenced on the Queen's Commemoration Day, **1897.**

VOL. IV. } MADRAS, JULY 1900. } No. 2.

TRANSLATIONS.

THE VEDA'NTA-SU'TRAS WITH S'RI'KANTHA BHA'SHYA.

(*Continued from page 5*).

Adhikarana 13.

And hence too, the accomplishment and the pervasion of heaven. (III. iii. 23).

The Rânâyaniyas in their khilas or supplementary texts read as follows:

"Brahman accomplished mighty deeds of valour; Brahman, the Supreme, in the beginning permeated heaven; even before the real did Brahman exist; with that Brahman, who is there fit to compete?"*

The acts known to all people,—namely, the act of burning the three worlds, the act of swallowing the deadly poison, and so on,—unsurpassed by any, and very hard for others to achieve, have been achieved by the Supreme Brahman in the form of Sri-kantha,—that Brahman who is Superior to Hari, Hara, and Hiranyagarbha and so on, and who lay pervading the abode of Supreme Heaven even prior to their creation. The question is, is it necessary or not necessary to think of this accomplishment of mighty deeds of valour and this pervasion over heaven, in all our contemplations of the Supreme Being?

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—Because these are, like others, attributes of Brahman, and because these are not spoken of with reference to any particular injunction, they should be thought of in all our contemplations of the Supreme.

(*Siddhânta*):—As against the foregoing we hold as follows: The permeation of the Divine Being through the supreme heaven should not be thought of in all our contemplations. By the very nature of the thing, it should be thought of only when we contemplate Brahman in abodes other than the small ones. "The Devas verily went to the region of Svarga, and they asked Rudra who He was:"* here the Sruti speaks of the Supreme Abode, which is Superior even to the

* Taitt. Brâ. 2-4-7.

* Atharvasiras.

abodes of Brahmâ and others, and which, as the seat of unsurpassed bliss, is called Svarga. Therefore, the permeation through heaven should be thought of in contemplating Brahman in abodes other than small ones, i.e., in contemplating the Vai'svânara and the like. As associated with it, even the accomplishment of mighty deeds of valour should be thought of in those cases only.

Adhikarana—14.

And so too in the Purusha-vidya, because of the absence of mention of others. (III. iii. 24).

Purusha-Vidyâ is taught in the Chhândogya and the Taittirîyaka Upanishads. "Purusha (man), verily, is a sacrifice. The twenty-four years of his life is the prâtas-savana or morning sacrifice," * and so on : in these words the Purusha-Vidyâ is taught in the one; and in the other it is taught in the following words: "He who thus knows,—his self is the sacrificer in the sacrifice, his faith is the wife, his body is the fuel, his breast is the altar." † A doubt arises as to whether the Vidyâs taught in the two upanishads are identical or different.

(*Pûrvapaksha* :)—Because the Vidyâs in both upanishads alike are named Purusha-Vidyâ, and because the different members of the sacrifice are imagined alike in both, the Vidyâs are identical.

(*Siddhânta* :)—As against the foregoing we hold as follows: The Purusha-Vidyâs taught in the two places are different; for, the members of the sacrifice declared in the Taittiriyaka—namely, the sacrificer, his wife, etc.,—as also the three savanas are not mentioned in the Chhândogya, whereas in the latter the three savanas are represented in quite a different way. In the Taittiriyaka the three savanas are represented in the following manner: "What we call evening, morning, and noon are the savanas;" while in the Chhândogya man's life-period is divided into three parts and these parts are represented as the savanas. In the Taittirîya, moreover, no specific fruit is declared. "For the Light of Brahman, one should utter 'Om' and contemplate A'tman ;"‡ in these words Brahma-Vidyâ has been taught, and the fruit thereof has been declared in the words "He attains Brahman's greatness;" and then is taught Purusha-vidyâ in the words 'He who thus knows,—his self is the sacrificer in the sacrifice." Thus the Purusha-Vidyâ is only an appendage of Brahma-Vidyâ, the subject of discourse, and its fruit is therefore the attainment of Brahman. In the Chhândogya, the fruit of the Purusha-Vidyâ is declared in the words "He lives sixteen hundred years, indeed."* Therefore, owing to a difference in the fruit and in the representation of the members of the sacrifice, the Vidyâs are not identical.

* Chhâ. 3-16.

† Mahânâ 52.

‡ Ibid 51.

* Chhâ. 3-16-6.

Adhikarana 15.

Because the act of piercing and other things are different. (III. iii. 25.)

At the commencement of the Taittiriya-Upanishad occur the following Mantras :

"May Mitra be propitious to us, and may Varuna be propitious."†

"May He protect us both."‡

A doubt arises as to whether these Mantras form part of the Vidyâ or not.

(*Pûrvapaksha* :)—Owing to their proximity to the Vidyâs, they form part of these Vidyâs.

(*Siddhânta*:)—As against the foregoing we hold as follows: just as the mantra which is read at the beginning of the Upanishad of the A'tharvanikas forms part of the abhichâra or magical rite intended to bring about death of the enemy because the mantra speaks of the piercing of the heart etc.,—or just as the rites of Mahâvrata and Pravargya treated of at the commencement of the Upanishads of the Aitareyins and the Vâjasaneyins are, in virtue of express injunctions, parts of sacrificial rites, so, these two mantras form mere appendages of the act of reciting the Veda as shewn by the words "The true shall I utter": "Efficient may our study prove." They are not parts of the Vidyâs, because they are intended for a different purpose. Mere proximity (sannidhi) is invalid when compared with sruti (direct declaration), linga (indicative mark), and Vâkya (context).

Adhikarana—16.

But where the getting rid of (good and evil) is mentioned. (we should understand the obtaining of good and evil by others) because the declaration of the former is subservient to the latter as in the case of the Kusas the metres, the praises and the singing. It has been explained (already) (III iii. 26.)

In one section (S'âkhâ) of the Veda, the sage who attains Brahman is said to be released from merit

† Tait. up. 1-1.

‡ Ibid. 2-1.

and demerit. In another section (S'âkhâ) of the Veda it is declared that, of the merit and demerit from which he has been thus released, the former enters into the friends and the latter into the enemies. In a third section (S'âkhâ) again, both the release from them and the places of their entrance are spoken of. All this is no doubt meant for contemplation. Here a doubt arises as to whether in all places both the release and the places of entrance should be contemplated or only one of them at one's option.

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—What is the *prima faice* view that suggests itself to us?—In the S'âtyâyayanaka, it is said that "His sons come by his property, his friends come by his merit, and his enemies come by his sins." The Tândins say, "shaking off all evil, as a horse shakes his hairs, and as the moon frees herself from the mouth of Rahu" * The Atharvana-upanishad says, "then he is wise, and shaking off good and evil he reaches the highest oneness free from passions."† Here, in the sruti which declares release from merit and demerit, we should not understand as declared the places into which the merit and the demerit enter, for the mere reason that the sruti which speaks of the release does not expressly speak of the matter.

(*Siddhânta*):—As against the foregoing we hold as follows: When the release alone is declared, or when the places of entrance alone are mentioned, it stands to reason that we should understand both as declared in conjunction, not one of them alone. The passage which speaks of the entrance is supplementary to that which speaks of the release, and should therefore form an appendage to it; for, as declaring where the abandoned merit and and demerit enter, the former passage necessarily presupposes the latter.

(*Objection*):—How can a passage which occurs in one section of the Veda be an appendage to that which occurs in another section?

(*Answer*):—Just as the passage "you Kusas, the children of the Udumbara-free", is supplemented by the passage which occurs elsewhere and which serves to particularise the Kusas; or just as the passage "by the metres of the Devas and the Asuras" is supplemented by the passage, "the metres of the Devas should come first," which occurs elsewhere; or just as the passage "he should offer the stotra of the *shodasin*-rite" is supplemented by the passage "he should offer the stotra of the *shodasin*-rite when the sun has half risen;"* or just as the passage "the ritviks should sing" is supplemented by the passage "the Adhvaryu priest should not sing," which excludes some of the ritviks from the operation of the injunction,—so also, when it is possible to make out the passage speaking of the entrance as one serving to supplement the passage which speaks of release from merit and demerit, it is not reasonable to say that one or the other of them should alone be contemplated.

It has been said in the first or ritualitic section of the Mimâmsâ as follows: "It should on the contrary form a supplement to the other statement, since the adoption of one alone is unreasonable." Here in the present case the passage speaking of the entrance serves to praise or magnify what is stated in the other.

(*Objection*):—How can one supplementary passage (arthavâda) presuppose another supplementary passage occurring in quite a different context?

(*Answer*):—This does not detract from the validity of our contention. For, we find that the supplementary passage, "The twenty-first from here is the sun we see," which is intented to praise the contemplation of Sâman, presupposes another supplementary passage, which occurs in the *sattra* section of the Taittiriya-samhita and which serves to determine how the sun is the twenty-first. This latter passage reads as follows:

> "Twelve are the months, five the seasons, three the words we see, and the twenty-first is the sun we see before us"

In these words it has been there determined how the sun constitutes the twenty-first in number. Therefore, though an arthavâda, the passage speaking of the merit and the demerit of the sage entering into his friends and enemies respectively should be understood as declared. Moreover, both the release and the entrance are mentioned in one passage in the Kaushîtakî-Upanishad in the following words:

> "And there he shakes off his good and evil deeds. His beloved relatives obtain the good, his unbeloved relatives the evil he has done."

Hence the conjunction of the two.

* Chhâ. Up. 8-13.
† Mund. Up. 3-1-3.

* Taitt. sam. 6—6—11.
† Ibid. 6—3—1.
‡ Taitl. Sam. 5-1 10.
§ Kaushî. 1-4.

Adhikarana—17.

(It should be thought of) at the time of departure, because of the absence of anything to be reached. So, indeed, others declare. (III. iii. 27).

A doubt arises as to whether the release from good and bad deeds should be thought of as taking place at the time of separation from the body or on the path to Brahman.

(*Pûrvapaksha*:)–In one place, the release from good and bad deeds is said to take place at the time of departure from the body, in the following words:

"Shaking off all evil as a horse shakes off his hairs.........and then shaking off his body......"

In another place it is said to take place on the path:

"He comes to the river Virajâ, and crosses it by the mind alone, and there shakes off his good and evil deeds."

Though thus there are two passages speaking of the matter in two different ways, the release should be regarded as taking place only at the time of departure from the body, inasmuch as there exists no enjoyment of pleasure or pain to be brought about by karma at a subsequent period, the attainment of Brahman alone having yet to be achieved. So, indeed, do others declare:

"For him there is only delay so long as he is not delivered. Then he will be perfect.‡"

Accordingly, soon after departure from the body, Brahman is attained.

(It may be interpreted) according to our will, because there is no contradiction to both. (III. iii. 28).

The S'ruti speaks of the release from good and bad deeds as taking place at the time of departure from the body; and it speaks of the attainment of Brahman as taking place after the release. In order that these two srutis may not be contradicted, we should understand the passage, "there he shakes off his good and evil deeds," according to the meaning, as suited to the context. That is to say, we should construe the passage as occurring prior to the passage "having reached this path of gods."§

|| (The journey on the path of gods is still) justifiable because we find a similar thing (taking place even after the attainment of Brahman), as in ordinary life. (III. iii. 29).

Despite the exhaustion of all Karma at the time of departure from the body, the journey on the path is quite justifiable in the case of the worshippers of Brahman. For we do find it said that (even after attaining Brahman) the liberated soul walks about enjoying. It has been said:

"He becomes an autocrat (svarâţ), he walks about at will in all worlds."*

It is like what takes place in ordinary life. In ordinary life, the proteges of kings obtain all things which are beyond the reach of others.† Similarly the passage which speaks of the path can also be explained. Though the whole karma has been exhausted at the time of departure from the body, still, in virtue of the Vidyâ, the linga-sarîra or subtle body remains, and therewith the journey on the path and the attendant acts may be effected, since then it is possible to walk about in the places located on the path, to converse with the Moon, and to do the other things spoken of in this connection.

(*Siddhânta*):—As against the foregoing we hold as follows:

The passage serves a purpose when the release takes place on both occasions; otherwise, indeed, there is a contradiction. (III iii. 30).

The passage of the soul on the path of the Gods (Devayâna) serves a purpose only when the exhaustion of Karma is held as taking place on both the occasions,—on the occasion of departing from the body as well as on the occasion of crossing over the river Virajâ. Otherwise, i. e., if the whole karma has been exhausted only at the time of departure from the body, the soul would be immediately liberated and the passage on the path of the Gods would serve no purpose at all; and this is inconsistent with the sruti which speaks of the passage on the path of Gods as well as with the sruti which, in the words "he unites with the supreme Light and attains to his own true being,"‡ declares that the soul attains to his true nature by way of attaining the illumination of intellect only after attaining to Brahman by the path of Gods. Therefore, though the soul's wandering in the several places, his conversation with the moon, and his passage on the path of Gods are all possible in virtue of the Vidyâ or wisdom, just as the subsequent

* Chhâ. 9-13
† Kaushi. 1-4-
‡ Chhâ.6-14-2.
§ Kaushi; 1-3.
|| This sûtra is intended to explain how the liberated soul's journey on the path of Gods is possible if he has been liberated from all Karma at death and therefore freed from body and the enses.

* Chhâ. 7-25-2.
† That is to say, in virtue of the Brahmavidyâ and by the Divine Grace all the things mentioned here are possible as the liberated soul is then invested with a spiritual body and with spiritual senses.
‡ Chhâ. 8-3-4.

wandering is possible in virtue of the Vidyâ, still, the samsâra, taking the form of intellectual narrowness, and continuing till Brahman is attained, cannot be explained as due to the power of Vidyâ. Wherefore it is necessary to admit the continuance of a part of Karma as forming the root of the samsâra. It cannot be maintained that this continuance of the samsâra is due—not to Karma, but—to the will of the Parames'vara or Supreme Lord; for we hold that the very will of the Lord constitutes the soul's Karma. Certainly, according to our theory, there exists no merit or demerit except the will of the Supreme Lord as governed by the doing of acts enjoined or of those prohibited by the s'ruiti.

(*Objection*):—If the manifestation of the soul's true nature in the from of intellectual illumination should take place after the attainment of Brahman, then the Karma which causes intellectual narrowness should continue till the attainment of Brahman. How can the exhaustion of Karma take place the moment after the crossing of the river Virajâ?

(*Answer*):—The very acts of crossing over the limits of the boundary line of the material universe constitutes the attainment of the abode of the Paramasiva, which is the Paramâkâsa, the supreme Light; and this is the attainment of Brahman which is spoken of in the words "having united with the Supreme Light." The river Virajâ, connected with the abode of Vishnu, constitutes the boundary line of the material universe. The yogins, who are freed from all taint of Karma on entering into the river, pass beyond Vishnu's abode and enter the spiritual abode of S'iva which is full of supreme bliss. Accordingly the sruti says:

"He reaches the goal of the path, and it is the supreme abode of Vishnu."

Hence no incongruity whatever.

Adhikarana 18.

The stay of the office-holders continues as long as the office lasts. (III. iii. 31.)

It has been said above that the Upâsakas or devotees of Brahman obtain release from good and bad deeds and attain to Brahman. Now a doubt arises as to whether those in office do or do not attain to salvation in addition to their enjoying of the office.

(*Pûrvapaksha*:)—It would at first seem that there is no salvation at all to the office-holders such as Vasishtha, inasmuch as the Purânas and other scriptures speak of their birth. Therefore the conclusion is that of the knowers of truth, some attain salvation, and others do not.

(*Siddhànta*:)—As against the foregoing we hold as follows: The office-holders have to enjoy fruits other than salvation even after the death of the body, till the Karma which has invested them with their respective offices is exhausted. Accordingly, till the termination of the offices, they have to stay there (in the samsâra) to enjoy the fruits of the Karma which has invested them with the offices; they cannot till then pass on to the path of Light (archirâdi-mârga). The prârabdha-karma of even those who have attained knowledge is exhausted only by the enjoyment of its fruits. Thus, those in office attain salvation on the termination of the office, and therefore the knowers of truth invariably attain salvation.

* Katha up-3-9.

Adhikarana—19.

No restriction as to any Vidya; and hence no contradiction to the Sruti and the Smriti. (III. iii. 32.)

The Sruti speaks of the path of Light in connection with the Upakosala-Vidyâ and the like. A doubt arises as to whether the path is restricted to the devotees of that Vidyà alone or is open to all devotees (upâsakas).

(*Pûrvapaksha*:)—In the Chhândogya, the Path of Light is mentioned in connection with the Upakosala-Vidyâ and the Panchâgni-Vidyâ alone; in the Atharvasiras it is slightly hinted at in connection with the Pâs'upata. It is not mentioned in connection with the S'ândilya-vidyâ and the like. The Path of Light must be restricted to those Vidyâs, in connection with which it has been mentioned; it cannot be extended to others.

(*Siddhánta*:)—As against the foregoing we hold as follows: There is no rule that the path is restricted to those Vidyâs with reference to which it has been mentioned. On the contrary it extends to all Upàsanas. Then alone will the S'ruti and the Smriti be uncontradicted. In the Panchâgni-vidyâ the Sruti extends the path to all without exception, in the words "And those who in the forest devote themselves to austerity and penance, they proceed towards Light."* The Smriti also (Bhagavadgîtâ VIII 24) extends the path to all without exception. Therefore the Path of Light is as a rule open to all Upâsakas alike.

Some interpret the Sutra as follows: There is no rule that the Path of Light is trodden by all Upasakas alike. Thus alone can the Sruti and the Smriti be absolved from all contradictions.

This interpretation also is unobjectionable; for, those who contemplate Nirguna Brahman, Brahman devoid of all atttributes have nothing to do with the path.

* Chhâ 5-10-1.

A. Maha'deva S'a'stry, B.A.

(*To be continued*).

SIVAJÑA'NA SIDDHIYA'R
OF
ARUL NANDI SIVA A'CHA'RYA

SUTRA III—PASU LAKSHANA.

(*Continued from page* 6).

1. There is a soul separate from the body. It is *existent*; it is united to a body, and possessed of faults (the feeling of 'I' and 'mine'); it *wills, thinks* and *acts* (Ichcha, Gnana and Kriya); it becomes conscious after dreams; it experiences pleasures and pains, (the fruits of Karma); it undergoes the five *avasthas*; and it rests in Turyatîta.

NOTES.

Each one of these statements is made in answer to a different theory as regards the soul. It is said to be 'existent,' in answer to those who deny the reality of a soul-substance, as such a thing is implied in the very act of denial. The next statement is made in answer to those who would assert that the body itself is the soul, and that there is no soul other than the body. The fact is though the soul may be in conjunction and correlation with the body, yet it asserts its own independence when it calls, "my body,' 'my eye" &c. Another asserts that the five senses form the soul. To him the answer is made that the soul is possessed of more powers than those exercised by the *gnanendriyas*. Another states that the *Sukshuma Sarira* forms the soul. The answer is that after awaking, one becomes conscious of the experiences in sleep as separate, the one becoming so conscious must be different from the dreambody. *Prana* is shown not to be the soul, as there is no consciousness in deep sleep, though *Prana* may be present. It is different again from God, as instead of its intelligence being self-luminous, it understands only in conjunction with the different states of the body. The combination of all the above powers of the body is shown not to be soul, inasmuch as it subsists even in the *Turyatîta* condition when all the bodily functions cease.

This stanza is further important as it gives a clear and concise definition of the soul or jivâtma, a definition which we fail to get in many other systems. It is shown to be different from the body composed of maya and its products, Buddhi, senses, &c., and also different from God. It is not to be identified with any one or with all or any combination and permutation of the bodily functions; nor is it a combination of the body (maya) and andakaranas and God or any *abhasa* of these. But how is it found? It is always found in union with a body, gross or subtle; and the mystery of this union is of more serious import than most other problems. It is possessed of certain powers, will, intellection, and power but distinguished from the Supreme Will and Power, inasmuch as this is faulty or imperfect and dependent. It is possessed of feeling and emotion, and suffers pain and pleasure as a result of its ignorance and union with the body; and this suffering is not illusory, which must distinguish it again from God, who is not tainted by any and who has neither likes nor dislikes, 'வேண்டுதல் வேண்டாமையிலான்,' 'பற்றற்றான்' 'மலமிலான் 'சஞ்சலமிலான், &c.

The soul is also limited by its coats, and this limitation is not illusory either.

Even after saying all this, there is one characteristic definition of the soul, which is alone brought out in the Siddhanta and in no other school, and which serves to clear the whole path of psychology and metaphysics, of its greatest stumbling blocks. We mean *its power* "அது அது ஆதல்." சார்ந்ததன் வண்ணமாதல், யாதொன்று பற்றினதன இயல்பாய் நிற்றல்," *to become identical with the one it is attached to*, and erasing thereby its own existence and individuality, the moment after its union with this other, and *its defect* or inability *to exist independent of either the body or God as a foothold or rest* (பற்றுக் கோடின்றி நிற்றலாகாமை). So that the closest physiological and biological experiment and analysis cannot discover the soul's existence in the body, landing, as such, a Buddha, and a Schopenhaur and a Tyndal in the direst despair and pessimism; and it is this same peculiarity which has foiled such an astute thinker as Sankara, in his search for a soul when in union with God. The materialist and idealist work from opposite extremes but they meet with the same difficulty, the difficulty of discovering a soul, *other* than matter or God. Hence it is that Buddha, and his modern day representatives the agnostics (it is remarkable how powerfully Buddha appeals to-day and is popular with these soul-less and God-less sect) declare the search for a *psyche* (soul) to be vain, for there is no psyche, in fact. And the absurdities and contradictions of the Indian idealistic school flows freely from this one defect of not clearly differentiating between God and soul.

This power or characteristic of the soul is brought out in the analogy of crystal or mirror, (see last note in my edition of " Light of Grace' or ' Tiruvarutpayan") and the defect of soul is brought out by comparing it to the agni or fire which cannot become manifest except when it is attached to a piece of firewood or wick. When once we understand this particular nature of the soul, how easy it is for one to explain and illustrate the " Tatvamasi" and other mantras, which are to be taught to the disciple for practising soul elevation. And in my reading, I never came upon a more remarkable book than a small pamphlet of Prof. Henry Drummond called the "*Changed life*," in which the analogy of the mirror is fully brought out, together with a full explanation of the process by which the soul elevation is effected. The text chosen by the learned theologian is that of St. Paul which we quote also.

" We all, with unveiled face, *reflecting, as a mirror,* the glory of the Lord are transformed into the same image, from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the spirit."

He paraphrases the sentence as follows, " We all reflecting as a mirror the character of Christ are transformed into the same image from character to character—from a poor character to a better one, from a better one to one a little better still, from that to one still more complete, until by slow degrees the perfect image is attained. Here the solution of the problem of sanctification is compressed into a sentence, reflect the character of Christ, and you will become like Christ," or as we will say, reflect the image of God in yourself, and you will become God like, or God.

But how is the poor character to be made better and better, or the reflecting image clearer and clearer ? It is by cleansing the mirror (soul) freer and freer from dirt, and bringing it more and more in line with the effulgent light, that this can be effected, and when the mirror is absolutely perfect and nearest, the light shines brightest, and so overpowers the mirror, that the mirror is lost to view, and the glory and Light of the Lord is felt. For, observes the learned Professor truly, "What you are conscious of is the ' glory of the Lord.' And what the world is conscious of, if the result be a true one, is also the ' glory of the Lord. In looking at a mirror, one does not see the mirror or think of it, but only of what it reflects. For a mirror never calls attention to itself—except when there are flaws in it." These flaws are the colours of the Siddhanti who compares them to the maya or body. In union with the body, it is the body alone that is cognized, and not the mirror-like soul. In union with God, the Glory and Light alone is perceived and not the mirror like soul either; and the Professor declares, " All men are mirrors—that is the first law on which this formula (of sanctification or corruption) is based. One of the aptest descriptions of a human being is that he is a mirror ", and we must beg our readers to go through the whole pamphlet to note how beautifully he draws out this parallel.

He notes the second principle which governs this process, namely, the law of assimilation or identification. "This law of assimilation is the second, and by far the most impressive truth which underlies the formula of sanctification–the truth that men are not only mirrors, but that these mirrors, so far from being mere reflectors of the fleeting things they see, transfer into their own inmost substance and hold in permanent preservation the things that they reflect. No one can know how the soul can hold these things. No one knows how the miracle is done. No phenomenon in nature, no process in chemistry, no chapter in Necromancy can even help us to begin to understand this amazing operation. For think of it, the past is not only focussed there in a man's soul, it is there. How could it be reflected from there if it were not there? All things he has ever seen, known, felt believed of the surrounding world, are now within him, have become part of him, in part are him—he *has been changed into their image.*"

These two principles infact underlie our mantra and tantra, our upasana, and Sadana, Bavana and Yoga, and our books instance the case of the snake charmer chanting the Garuda Mantra in illustration of this second principle of assimilation or identification. The doctrine of regarding God as *other* than the soul requires very elaborate treatment, and we hope to deal with it separately. It is the one point which distinguishes the true Vedanta as borne out by the text of the Vedanta Sutras themselves and which is accepted by all the Tamil philosophers like Tirumular and Tayumanavar and others, and the Vedanta so called, as interpreted and expounded by Sankara.

Soul is other than Body and Prana.

2. Why should you require a soul other than the body ? Does the body itself feel and know ? Then

if so, why does not the body feel when it becomes a corpse? If it be replied that feeling is absent, as Prana is absent; then, there is no feeling either in sleep, though Prana is present in the body.

The five Senses do not constitute the soul.

3. If the senses constitute real soul, then why dont they perceive in sleep. Then the senses perceive one after another and each one a different sensation. You say this is their nature. But it is a defect that one sense does not perceive another sensation. What cognises each sense and sensation and all together must be different from all these and it is the soul. The five senses have no such cognition.

Prana is not the soul.

4. Prana is the conscious Being as there is no conciousness when the breath is stopped temporarily or permanently. But it is not concious in deep sleep. You say this is so, as it is not in conjunction with the senses. But if the Prana is the soul, the senses cannot drop when Prana is conscious. The soul really cognises everything, by controlling the Prana.

SUTRA IV.

AVASTHA LAKSHANA.

Adhikarana—I.

Soul is not the Andakarana.

1. You say the conscious being is the *Andakarana*. But none of these senses cognises each other's operation. Each in fact performs a different function. The soul understands all, controls all, in union with them, bringing them into manifestation or not, in the various *Avasthas*, and stands apart with the consciousness of 'I' and 'mine.'

The three kinds of Gnana: Pasa, Pasu and Pathi Gnana.

2. Manas, Buddhi, Chittam, and Ahankara are the instruments of the soul. The union with the soul is such that the andakaranas look as though they are the real soul. Regarding it merely as a light (which aids the eye in darkness), and clearly distinguishing it as such from the soul, one understands the soul, he understand his real self. Such knowledge is *Pasugnanam*. Then will be induced the higher knowledge, *Pathignana* or *Sivagnana*.

NOTE:—The identifying of soul with the Products of Maya is *Pasagnana*. The knowledge of one's own nature as distinct from matter and from God is *Pasugnana* or *Atmagnana*. Where even this consciousness is merged and lost in the contemplation and enjoyment of The Highest Bliss, he attains to Pathignana.

The expression 'தன்னை யறிதல்' "தன்னை யுணர்தல்" is very often misunderstood and misinterpreted. It simply means "understanding oneself", understanding his real nature, and does not mean "understanding oneself as God or as anything else". After attaining this self-knowledge, the Vedas postulate distinctly a higher knowledge, the knowledge of God and such passages are again misinterpreted to mean that "the soul sees God as himself" When in fact the last two words 'as himself' is nowhere found in the text.

Their Akshara.

3. The Akshara, A, U, M, Vindhu and Nada respectively represent and influence Ahankara, Buddhi, Manas, Chittam, and Soul. All these together form the Pranava (sukshuma). The way the consciousness rises and falls is as the rise and fall of the waves in the sea. When considered deeply, the nature of their action will be manifest.

Their Devatas.

4. Brahma, Vishnu, Rudra, Maheshwara, and Sadasiva respectively guide the letters A, U, M, Vindhu and Nada. It is in this fivefold union the soul cognises, and as such is more like asat. If one controls in yoga his two breaths and examines them, their nature can be plainly seen.

J. M. N.

(*To be continued.*)

A HYMN FROM DEVARAM.

"DEATH OF SIN."

The musical hymn quoted below to which I have added a translation in English verse, is from the Devaram of Saint Thirunâvukkarasu, whose life and spiritual experiences will be found briefly sketched in Vol. III of this journal. In this hymn, the Saint teaches us how to "die unto sin" and points out the importance of personal love and devotion to God. "The letter killeth but the spirit giveth life"; and however carefully one may conform to the externals of religion, he gains nothing unless the truly religious spirit permeates and enthusiasises him.

பாவநாசத் திருக்குறுந்தொகை.

திருச்சிற்றம்பலம்.

பாவமும் பழிப் பற்றற வேண்டுவீர்
ஆவிலைஞ் சுகந்தாடு மவன் கழல்
மேவராய் மிகவும் மகிழ்ந் துள்குமின்
காவலாளன் கலந் தருள் செய்யுமே. (க)

From hold of moral blame and sin,
O ye who would be truly free!
Adore the holy feet of Him,
Our Dancing Lord,[1] and think of Him
With love and joy. The Watcher[2] will
With you abiding grant His grace. (1)

கங்கை யாடிலென் காவிரி யாடிலென்
கொங்கு தண்கு மரித்துறை யாடிலென்
ஓங்கு மாகட லோதநீ ராடிலென்
எங்கு மீச னெனாதவர்க் கில்லையே. (உ)

What though ye bathe in Ganga's stream[3]?
What though ye bathe in Kav'ri's flow?
What though ye bathe in waters, cool
And sweet to smell, off Comorin?
What though ye bathe in waving seas?
It boots him nought who does not feel
That ev'rywhere the Lord pervades[4]. (2)

பட்ட ராகிலென் சாத்திரங் கேட்கிலென்
இட்டு மட்டமு மீதொழில் பூணிலென்
எட்டு மொன்று மிரண்டு மறியிலென்
இட்ட மீசனெ னுதவர்க் கில்லையே. (௩)

What though ye be great doctors wise[5]?
What though ye hear the shastras read?
What though the duty ye assume
Of doling out cooked food and gifts*?
What though ye know the eight and two[6]?
It boots him nought who does not feel
The noble truth that God is love[7]. (3)

வேத மோதிலென் சாத்திரங் கேட்கிலென்
நீதிநூல் பல நித்தல் பயிற்றிலென்
ஓதி யங்கமோ ராறு முணரிலென்
ஈசனை யுள்குவார்க் கன்றி யில்லையே. (௪)

What though ye chant the Vedas four?
What though ye learn the scriptures all?
What though ye daily teach Ethics?
What though ye know the sciences six[8]?
Avails it nought to all but those
That think of Him, Our Lord that is. (4)

காலை சென்று கலந்துநீர் மூழ்கிலென்
வேலை தோறும் விதிவழி நிற்கிலெ

---

(1) The dance is symbolic of the origination of Creative Vibration in the primordial substance of the universe. The passage in the original refers to the five acts of God:—*Srishti* (origination), *Sthithi* (maintenance), *Samhara* (Involution) *Tirobava* (obscuration), and *Anugraha* (grace).

(2) *cf.* "காக்குமெங் காவலனே காண்பரிய பேரொளியே"
"O Watcher protecting, O Light rarely seen!"
—Thiruvachakam.

cf. also "Ye watch, like God, the rolling hours
With larger other eyes than ours"—Tennyson.

(3) Bathing in sacred waters has ever been considered meritorious by Hindus.

(4) *cf.* Thirumanthram:—

"காலினி லூறுங் கரும்பினிற் கட்டியும்
பாலினுள் நெய்யும் பழத்துள் இரதமும்
பூவினு ணாற்றமும் போலுள னெம்மிறை
காவல னெங்குங் கலந்து நின்றானே."

"As motion in wind, as sugar in cane,
As ghee in milk, as juice in fruit,
As scent in bloom—e'en so pervades
My Lord, the Watcher, everywhere."

(5) *cf.* Amiel:—The kigdom of God belongs not to the most enlightened but to the best; and the best man is the most unselfish man."

* *cf.* Thomas à Kempis:—"He who has genuine and perfect charity, in nothing seeks himself, but desires God to be glorified in all things."

(6) The ten upanishads seem to be meant here.

(7) *cf.* "That God which ever lives and loves"—Tennyson. Also, Thirumanthram:—

"என்பே விறகா விறைச்சி யறுத்திட்டுப்
பொன்போற் கனலிற் பொரிய வறுப்பினும்
அன்போ டுருகி யகங்குழை வார்க்கன்றி
என்பொன் மணியினை யெய்த வொண்ணாதே."

(8) The sciences subsidiary to Vedic study, *viz.*, Siksha, (Philology), Kalpa (Rituals), Vyakarana (Grammar), Nirukta (Etimology), Chandas (Prosody), and Jyotisha. (Astronomy).

ஞலை வேள்வி யடைந்து வேட்கிலென்
ஏல வீசனென் பார்க்கன்றி யில்லையே. (௫)

What though ye go at dawn and bathe ?
What though ye do each act by rule[9] ?
What though ye sacrifices make[10] ?
Avails it nought to all but those
That speak of Him, the blessing Lord. (5)

கான நாடு கலந்து திரியிலென்
ஈன மின்றி யிருந்தவஞ் செய்யிலென்
ஊனை யுண்ட லொழிந்து வானோக்கிலென்
ஞான னென்பவர்க் கன்றி நன்கில்லையே. (௬)

What though ye roam through lands and wilds[11] ?
What though ye faultless penance make ?
What though ye give up eating meat
And heav'nward look ? None wins reward
But those that praise the knowing Lord. (6)

கூட வேடத்த ராகிக் குழுவிலென்
வாடி யூனை வருத்தித் திரியிலென்
ஆடல் வேடத்த னம்பலக் கூத்தனைப்
பாட லாளர்க் கல்லாற் பயனில்லையே. (௭)

What though in false disguise[12] ye move ?
What though ye mortify your flesh[13] ?
None wins a meed but those that sing
The Lord that dances in the Void. (7)

நன்று நோக்கிலென் பட்டினி யாகிலென்
குன்ற மேறி யிருந்தவஞ் செய்யிலென்
சென்று நீரிற் குளித்துத் திரியிலென்
என்று மீசனென் பார்க்கன்றி யில்லையே. (௮)

What though your views are proper, true ?
What though ye fast ? Upon a hill
What though ye make a penance great ?
What though ye bathe and show you fair ?
It boots none aught but those that feel
That all through time the Lord perduces. (8)

கோடி தீர்த்தங் கலந்து குளித்தவை
ஆடி னாலு மரனுக் கன்பு இல்லையேல்
ஓடு நீரினை யோட்டைக் குடத்தட்டி
மூடி வைத்திட்ட மூர்க்கனோ டொக்குமே. (௯)

E'en though in million waters he bathe,
If for the Lord he bears no love,
He peers the fool who water pours
Within a pot with holes and shuts
The lid, and thinks the water safe. (9)

மற்று நற்றவஞ் செய்து வருந்திலென்
பொற்றை யுற்றெடுத் தானுடல் புக்கிறக்
குற்ற நற்குரை யார்கழற் சேவடி
பற்றி லாத வர்க்குப் பயனில்லையே. (௧௦)

What though one painful penance make ?
Unless he clings to the feet of Him
That crushed him[14] who would lift His mount,
For all he does no meed he wins. (10)

N. B.

PREEMINENCE OF TAMIL.

Mr. Alkondavilli G.—sends us the following Extract with Translation.

Extract from "*Sambhu Rahasyam.*" Chapter 267.

తస్మాత్కావ్యంచికీర్షూణాం బుభుత్సానాంచధీమతాం ।
అవశ్యంప్రాకృతంగ్రాహ్యం యథైవకిలసంస్కృతం ॥ 33 ॥
ఏవమేవవిజానీహి ద్రావిడంచాపిభాషితం ।
వ్యాకర్తాసహిసర్వజ్ఞో యస్యాగస్త్యోమహామునిః ॥ 34 ॥
మాముద్దిశ్యతపశ్చక్రే పురాఽగస్త్యోమహామునిః ।
మయాప్రదత్తవిజ్ఞానో ద్రామిడీంవ్యాకృతింవ్యధాత్ ॥ 35 ॥
అగస్త్యప్రార్థనాతుష్ట బ్రహ్మదత్తవరాఇమా ।
నాఽపభ్రంశదోషోస్తి ద్రామిడీనాంగిరాంతతః ॥ 36 ॥
యథైవసాంస్కృతీభాషా ప్రయుక్తాస్వర్గదాయినీ ।
ప్రాకృతీద్రామిడీచాపి తథైవస్వర్గదాయికే ॥ 37 ॥
అతోఽన్యాఃఖలుయాభాషా ఆంధ్రకర్ణాటదేశజాః ।
అనార్షత్వాదపభ్రంశా ఇతిశాస్త్రవిదాంమతం ॥ 38 ॥
తస్మాద్భాషాంతరీయాణాం కావ్యానాందోషకీర్తనం ।
ప్రాకృతాద్ద్రామిడీచ్చాపి విభిన్నవిషయంభవేత్ ॥ 39 ॥

Translation.

Siva informs Parvati :—

"For the wise who are desirous of composing poetry, the indigenous (languages) is as certainly to be acquired as the Samskrit. 33.

(9) *cf.* Paley :—"He that loveth God keepeth his commandments; but still the love of God is something more than keeping the commandments."

(10) *cf.* Bhagavad Gita :—"The worship of God in spirit is far superior to His worship with the offerings of things."

(11) *i. e.* on holy pilgrimage.

(12) *i. e.* of religious orthodoxy.

(13) *cf.* Bhagavad Gita :—"Whatsoever oblation, gift, *austerity*, deed, is wrought without faith, "asat" it is called; it is nought, here or hereafter."

(14) The ten-headed Ravana in arrogance tried to lift up Mount Kailas, the abode of Siva; but Siva, with a slight pressure of his toe, crushed his shoulders. This story allegorises the futility of human will and might against the omnipotence of God.

Even so, know, is the Dravid (Tamil) language,
which, the great sage Agastya indeed did systematize. 34.

In the past, did this great sage Agastya meditate
on Me (Siva);

And by knowledge granted by Me, did he design
the Dravid (Tamil) grammar. 35.

Dravid is a gift from Brahma, pleased by the prayer of Agastya;

Hence no blame of unscientificness lies against its
logology. 36.

Just as much as the Samskrit tongue is designed
for Heaven-giving

Is indigenous Dravid the bestower as well of
Heaven. 37.

Hence other languages such as are born in the
lands Andhra and Karnata,
are not virgin, because untraceable to Rishis,—so
say linguists. 38.

As thus poetry in other languages need apology

The indigenous Dravid needeth it not, for 'tis
unique. 39.

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL—No. III.

There are two classes of events in this world, controllable and uncontrollable (by man). Man makes history, and God makes His history. "Circumstances over which one had no control" is an expression often heard. The query is, how happen those circumstances? No answer comes as there is a veil drawn *behind* you and *before* you, beyond which you *are not to penetrate*. The mystery is evidently too sacred for sinful eyes to see.

"నమాంసచక్షురభివీక్షతేతం"

The scales from one's eyes have first to drop off, by a course of training which anybody who will knock will find.

Controllable events are those which lie in the power and present personal responsibility of an agent within a certain defined limit of liberty of action. Beyond which and as a necessary reaper of what was in the past sown by him, he is out-controlled, Nemesis demanding retribution. A capricious Divine Will creating an universe of differences all at once is thus an unacceptable position to Aryan metaphysics. Events appearing evil relatively to time, space, and conditions, change their aspect when any of those are altered. There are, as the saying goes, "always two sides to a picture."

15. Do phenomena of nature uphold the theory of the anarchists? No, as they bristle with in equalities and dependence. Among the Aryans and their system of Government, on the other hand, monarchy is a Divine institution; and if only the Anarchists can become Aryans, the evils of Socialistic and Nihilistic movements which threaten Europe will cease immediately. Their vision extends as far as the horizon of this days' life, and their motto is nearly this: (1) "ఋణంకృత్వా ఘృతంపిబ," and (2) "భస్మీభూతస్య దేహస్య పునరాగమనంకుతః?" If only the light of Asia will beam into their vision, convincing them of the necessary gulf created by merit and de-merit spread over inconceivable stretches of time in the past and necessarily bridged over again in the righting afforded by the eternal expanse of time in the future, there will be as much peace, submission and brotherhood as votaries of the Aryan Dharma alone have known and practiced. Peep behind the veil; and the full sense of equality and liberty is satisfied; and the Anarchist will then complaisantly say that when "he sits in the Palki, he would toterate the Palki bearers in his large heart!"

16. The difficulty felt by all right-thinking minds is because they stand on the brink of an unpassable chasm beyond; and if only like the Hindus, a shore beyond is accepted—accepted it must be, as of Hobson's choice—Mill would not have got bewildered into saying—"If it be said that God does not take sufficient account of pleasure and pain to make them the reward or punishment of the good or the wicked, but that virtue is itself the greatest good and vice the greatest evil, then these at least ought to be dispensed to all according to what they have done to deserve them; instead of which, every kind of moral depravity is entailed upon multitudes by the fatality of their birth; through the fault of their parents, of society, or of uncontrollable circumstances, certainly through no fault of their own." *Certainly through fault of their own in other lives than this*, echoes Aryan Divine Science.

17. Setting aside all argument for an optimistic view of the universe, and recognizing that evil exists, a justification for such existence as contributing to ennoble human nature (here it is to be noted that so stated, it again becomes the very argument that was set aside) is even accepted by Mill, and is therefore very valuable:—"One only form of belief (which) stands wholly clear both of intellectual contradiction and of moral obliquity, is that which * * * regards Nature and Life * * * as the product of a struggle between contriving goodness and an intractable material, as was believed by Plato, or a Principle of evil, as was the doctrine of the Manicheans. A creed like this, which I have known to be devoutly

held by at least one cultivatad and conscientious person of our own day, allows it to be believed that all the mass of evil which exists was undesigned by, and exists not by the appointment of, but in spite of the Being whom we are called upon to worship. A virtuous human being assumes in this theory the exalted character of a fellow-laborer with the Highest, a fellow-combatant in the great strife; contributing his little, which, by the aggregation of many like himself becomes much towards that progressive ascendency, and ultimately complete triumph of good over evil, which history points to, and which this doctrine teaches us to regard as planned by the Being to Whom we owe all the benevolent contrivance we behold in nature." Assuming that there is a principle of evil, there is doubtless the principle of good. Let any one deny the latter, and prove his denial? This he will find an impossible task. What are human feelings? They are something not to be despised, in the cosmagony, even tho' they may be an impalpable kind of something. What do they teach us? They teach us the moral lesson that even while reading a tale, or witnessing a drama, they are on the tiptoe of expectation to find that (1) Good triumphed over evil, (2) and that they find good all the more set off by as much as it had had to contend with evil.

Our Scriptures divide the kosmos into four parts, three of which—త్రిపాద్విభూతిః—comprise the kingdom of good, and the fourth part the kingdom,—it does not say of evil—of the unliberated or bound souls, for their temporary or probationary residence. In the former are Mill's "many * * * becoming much"; and we usually talk of "the *majority*" to whom we temporary sojourners on earth have to "go over" in due season.

18. Is evil a necessity? (This opens a wide field for inquiry. What if all were kings, and there were no subjects? What if there was nothing like difficulty, in all acts and aspirations? What if we never had such an ordinance of nature as sleep? What if it were all one white colour to paint a picture with? What if we felt no hunger? and what if there was no death? Under the conditions as above set forth, what would this world be like? Naturally, it would again have to be asked, what if we were all gods? and next, what if we were all one instead of many. *i.e.*, instead of appearing as several drops, were one as the ocean? It does appear as if such questions were the ramblings of a diseased mind, the flutters of a winged imagination, or the yearnings of a morbid heart? On reflection and to him who has a philosophical turn of mind, desirous of divining into the depths of the all-surrounding mystery, the questions are of weighty and interesting import. It would be more difficult than easy to take up each of the supposed novel conditions and construct a new world on that basis. For the present the desire to stroll in those regions may be repressed, and this may be said that all reasonable inquiry may stand satisfied with accepting things as we find them, face the rigid facts as are presented to us by a ready-made world, and try—as far as a power to whose control we are imparatively subject allows to our little minds the ability to penetrate the sublime mystery—to cognize a *noumenon* behind all phenomena, knowing which all our doubts shall dissolve and all our pain shall cease! When our immortal principle throws off the material shackles by which it is by a hidden destiny imprisoned, then a new set of conditions—which while new may still be asserted as an unbroken chain of progressive life and of the kind suppositiously stated above—will be presented to the probated soul, as briefly sung in the lines :—

"Another sun gleams there! another moon!
Another Light,—not Dusk, nor dawn, nor noon—
Which they who once behold return no more;
They have attained my rest, life's utmost boon."

"నతద్భాసయతేసూర్యో నశశాంకోనపావకః
యద్గత్వానినివర్తంతే తద్ధామపరమంమమ"

Bh. Gíta: XV-6

Equivalent to the passage in the Upanishads :—

"నతత్రసూర్యోభాతి - నచన్ద్రతారకం" &c.

There, no (this) sun shines, no (this) moon and no (these) stars.

If evil, then, is a necessity, it is an instituted order and congruous with the design of a benevolent Providence; and therefore a part and parcel in the general scheme of goodness, like a dark screen in a dark room required for the best effects of a magic-lantern exhibition. Who would resent this darkness; on the other hand, the wish would be for more. Conceive the beauty of the lightening from the bosom of the darkest cloud! Dr. Rajendra Lala Mitra says in his preface to the Yoga Aphorisms of Patanjali:—"The doctrine of evil as inseparable from the world is nearly as old as humanity. It was the dread of evil that drove the primitive man to seek the shelter of superhuman power and laid the foundation of religion. There would have been no religion if there had been no dread of evil, here or hereafter. Nor would philosophy have had its birth had not the necessity arisen to discriminate between good and evil. Morality, too, presupposes a differentiation between that which is proper and that which is improper—of a consciousness, however vague and undefined, of future reward and punishment. Doubtless the doctrine assumes constant and unalloyed evil and not a mixture of good and evil." In these words "mixture of good and evil" lies my meaning which I indicated in No. 1, of this series of Articles, *viz.*, that there is no *absolute* evil.

ALKONDAVILLI G.

KAMPANOLOGY IV.

நொய்தி நொய்ய சொன்னூற்க லுற்றேனெனை
வைத வைவின் மராமர மேழ்தொளை
எய்த வெய்தவற் கெய்திய மாக்கதை
செய்த செய்தவன் சொன்னின்ற தேயத்தே.
(பாயிரம். 5).

1. நொய்தின் நொய்யசொல்=words, feeble as feebleness (itself). நொய்தினும் would mean "feebler than," but as it is allowable to omit the உம் in poetry, we may render the expression as "feebler than feebleness." நொய்து means strictly "that which is feeble." Feebleness is properly expressed by நொய்ம்மை. Compare திருவினிற் திரு in அயோத். மந்தரை. 56.

2. சொன்னூற்கல்=with the ன் retained, would be correct if சொன் were an accented syllable. But as explained in Kampanology III, the true scansion of this line being, as I take it, ம், கூவிளம், கூவிளம், கூவிளம், the syllable சொன் is unaccented, (it being the end of the metrical syllable called விளம்) therefore the ன் cannot be retained. For, though it is proper to say பொன்னன்று and பொன்னணி, yet, on the other hand, we must say செம்பொனன்று and செம்பொனணி. In நல்வினையுந் நயந்தந்தின்று of the Kovayar, the word உம், which is usually unaccented, takes an accent for the sake of the meter, and accordingly the ம், instead of being elided, is retained in its substitute ந். In English too—we have the general rule that words ending in a single consonant preceded by a single vowel double the final consonant in taking an additional syllable such as er, ed, &c., only when the accent is on that vowel. Compare "deferred" with "differed" "fitted" with "benifited" &c. Accordingly சொன்னின்ற in the fourth line retains the consonant as சொல் is an accented syllable. நொய்தின் loses it because தி is a ம and not a மா.

3. நூற்கல்=to spin thread. It is derived from நூல், a thread, which is said to be derived the meaning of நூல், a "treatise." And the author of the நன்னூல் gives the following fanciful analogy to show how a "treatise" resembles a "thread."

> The words are the cotton,
> The treatise is the thread,
> The author is the spinner,
> His mouth is the hand that spins,
> His intellect is the spindle.

Some authors explain it by saying that it is so used in imitation of the Sanscrit tantri which means both a string of a lute and a treatise.

4. It seems more natural to derive நூல் from நுவல் to speak. But the next inquiry is whence do we get நுவல்? I am not able to answer it. The letter ந however occures in several words having some relations to the mouth, as நுகர், நுங்கு to eat; நுணவு to move the tongue; நகை, நகு to laugh, in Telugu; நங்கு, நக்கு to lick; நரல் to sound; நருமு to gnash; நன்னல் to nibble; நா, நாக்கு, நாவு tongue; நாய், நாளி dog; நுவணம் treatise; நுதல், நவில், நச்சு to speak. அனுங்கு, சிணுங்கு, முணுமுணு, கனை, &c. It is likely that கனை comes from the same source as its English equivalent "neigh" and the Latin "hinnare."

5. It strikes me that from பன், (allied with Sans. பர்ணம்) the mat-grass, may be derived பன்னல் or பன்னுதல் to weave. From this may arise பன்னுவல் of which பனுவல், "a treatise" may be a short form. If பன், the grass, is the real origin of பனுவல், we get back to the process by which "treatise" comes from "thread." Compare பன்னுடை, பன்னுங்கு, மின்னல், பனை.

6. The meaning of the whole stanza is as follows:—

"I have undertaken to spin very feeble words in the country in which is extant the work of the performer of austerities who sang the great history which has occurred to him who so shot (his arrow) that (the) seven big trees received openings (through their trunks) like (the openings made in my heart by) the censures with which (the learned) have censured me."

In order to complete the sense of the stanza, it is necessary to add some such words as these:—

"See what a foolish thing it is for me to undertake?"

7. தவம்=penance. தவன்=ascetic. செய்தவன்=he who has austerities that are performed.

KAMPANOLOGY V.

வையமென்னை யிகழவு மாசெனக்
கெய்தவும்மிதி யம்புவ தியாதெனில்
பொய்யில்கேள்விப் புலமையி னோர்புகல்
தெய்வமாக்கவி மாட்சி தெரிக்கவே. (பாயிரம். 6).

1. The second line ought to be written with ஃ between மி and தி, because இது &c., ought always to be changed into இஃது or ஈது &c., when the next

word begins with a vowel, except where the change would interfere with the meter. According to the view of scansion explained in Kampanology III, there is no occasion for omitting the ஃ here. For the doubling of ம் in எய்தவும் and its omission in இகழவும் see number 2 of the preceding section.

2. On the same view the இ in தியாது being short by the rule,

யகரம் வரக்குறள் உத்திரி இகரமும்
அசைச்சொன் மியாவின் இகரமுங் குறிய,

it is cut off for the sake of the தளை, in accordance with the rule,

தளைசீர் வண்ணந் தாங்கெட வரினே
குறுகிய இகரமும் குற்றிய லுகரமும்
அளபெடை ஆவியும் அலகியல் பிலவே.

3. In the latter rule, it must be observed by the way, that அளபெடை ஆவி is a slip of the pen; for, அளபெடை is, in its very nature, a vowel or consonant introduced for the purpose of filling the meter when there occurs a hiatus. What is there contemplated by அளபெடை ஆவி is the pure vowel which occurs in such words as குரீஇ, ஆஉ &c. It is this vowel that may be deleted or retained according as the scansion requires.

4. In தியம்பு also, the இ is short. But it is retained for the sake of the தளை, that is, supposing my manner of scanning the வேறு to be correct.

5. தெரிதல்=to select (குறள் அதி 47. 51. 52), or to be evident as தெரிநிலை (இலக். கொத்து) தெரித்தல்=தெரிவித்தல்=to make evident or to cause to select.

¶ தெய்வமாக்கவி மாட்சிதெரிக்க=to show forth the excellence of the divine poem (not by means of my translation, but by comparison with it).

6. There is another reading, namely மாக்கதை (see Winslow under தெரித்தல்), which implies that the excellence of the story in the original may be gathered even from my translation though it is a despicable one.

7. In the Naidatam we have "திங்களு நல்லார் முகமுஞ் செவ்வி தெரிக்கொண்ணு, which means that, in regard to beauty, it is not possible to choose between the face of the moon and the faces of the ladies." In the Kasikandam தெரிவு probably stands for தெரித்தல், that is as "making a thing evident by description" in the phrase தெரிவருந்தவம்.

8. பொய்யில் கேள் விப்புலமையினோர் புகல் கவி-the poem sung by the poet of faultless learning, *i. e.*, Valmiki. if we take the plural as merely honorific, having reference to stanza the fifth which immediately precedes this stanza. If we take it as referring to the 7th which follows, it may include வசிட்டர் and போதாயனர் also.

KAMPANOLOGY VI.

In அயொத். கிளை-ன்டு. the stanzas 60-69 are constructed on the principle of வெந்தளை, which may be said to extend from the end of one line in a stanza to the beginning of another in it, inasmuch as each line ends in a காய் and begins with a நேர். But that is an accident.

One of those stanzas namely the 66th begins its lines with வண்மை இயும், திண்மை இயும், &c. I donot see the use of the அளபெடை in those lines. If all the first சீர் in the வேறு be supposed to be காய் (to which they may be reduced but not without an awkwardness and difficulty unusual to Kampan) வண்மை இயு &c., would not be காய், but கனி instead. To regard வண்மை இயு as a காய் one should suppose the ஐ to become short soon after giving birth to the இ in order to form a நிரை with the இ so born. But this is unwarrantable. I think therefore the அளபெடை to be, objectionable, and the true scansion to consist in the law of வெண்டளை.

In the same Kandam, நகர்நீங்கு. (in which the same law is observed even between the end of one line of a stanza and the beginning of the next line in it (this is specially perceptible in stanza 91), there is one line that violates the தளை. That line is the third of the 113th stanza. It stands in the printed editions thus:

பேதைமகளைப் பின்பார்த்து நிற்குமா. Here an அளபெடை இ after ளை will cement the breach.

KAMPANOLOGY VII.

தேவபாடை யினிக்கதை செய்தவர்
மூவரானவர் தம்முளு முந்திய
நாவினுருரை யின்படி நான்றமிழ்ப்
பாவினுலிஃ துணர்த்திய பண்பரோ. (பாயிரம். 7).

If the reading தப்மினும் be preferred, நாவினர் will then mean the goddess of learning.

If we take படி as the predicate of the sentence of which பண்பு is the subject, we need supply no words to complete the sentence, except the copula, which is never expressed in Tamil.

KAMPANOLOGY VIII.

ஆசலம்புரி ஐம்பொறி வாளியும்
காசலம்பு முலையவர் கண்ணெனும்
பூசலம்பு நெறியின் புறஞ்செலாக்
கோசலம்புனை ஆற்றணி கூறுவாம். (பால. ஆற்றுப். 1).

ஆசலம=ஆசு, அலம்=faults (and) sufferings
or ஆ, சலம்=growing bad feelings
புரி=புரிகின்ற

முலையவர்...கூறுவாம்=let us describe the beauties of the river which adorns Kosalam (in which) the darts (called the) five senses and the turbulent (பூசல்) darts called women's eyes do not go out of the path (of rectitude).

காசு...யவர்=of them on whose breasts jewels tinkle=women's.

1. In the preceding eight sections under the heading of Kampanology, although I have given my own views, yet my object has been to elecit information.

To go through the whole series of the difficult verses of the Iramayanam, in the way I have commenced, would be as inexhaustible a task as that proposed to herself by the proverbial cat of Kampan. I think it will be more to the purpose, if each student of Kampan will state his own view or his own difficulty through this journal and invite explanation thereon from its readers.

Accordingly I append a request embracing a few of my difficulties.

Give the various readings and the meaning of

1. ஆதியந்தமரீ (பால. சிறப். 3)
2. பூணினும்புகழே (நகரப். 13)
3. எய்யவில்வளைத்ததும் (பால. கோலங். 37)
4. துறந்துபோயினான்: (அயோத். பள்ளி. 132)
இது யார்கூற்று? இதனிற்பிறர்கூற்று யாதும்கொண்டு கூறப்பட்டுண்டோ? சொல்லெச்சம் உண்டோ?
5. உரைசெய்மன்னன் (ib 134). மேலை உசா.
6. சூலமுண்டது (உயுத். கும்ப. 121). சூலம் உண்டு is plain. But the rest?

C. Brito.

NACCHINARKKINIYAR: A STUDY.

(*From the Madras Christian College Magazine*).

The latter half of the century now drawing to a close has witnessed a remarkable advance in the study and knowledge of the Tamil language. While the work of former centuries was merely to accumulate writings of every kind except the purely scientific, this century began with the classification of these varied writings and prepared the way for the propagation of a knowledge of them among the masses; while the latter half of it has effected a fusion of the historical spirit with the analytical. The scepticism of European scholars, with the exception of Dr. Hultzsch, in regard to the antiquity of Tamil literature, has led them frequently to ridicule the Tamilians. No Tamil work, whatever its merits, or whatever the dialect in which it was written, was assigned to a period earlier than the tenth century. The genuineness of the poems of *Pattanattu Pillaiyar* and the works of *Auvaiyâr* was seriously questioned. A handful of native scholars, however, who had received the benefit of an English education, imbibed the historical spirit of modern times and set themselves to help forward the investigation of their own antiquities. These men possessed two things in which many European scholars were wanting, a due veneration for the Tamil language and literature, and a critical acquaintance with classical Tamil works. And the result was marvellous. Tamil literature has been proved to have existed prior to the beginning of the Christian era, and the dates of many works have been fixed.

But it is to be regretted that, in spite of this rapid progress, unmerited oblivion has been the lot of one who did more than any one else to sustain the study of the oldest classics, and so keep scholars in touch with the language, the manners, and the customs of the remote ancestors of the Tamilians. The *Tolkâppiyam Poruladhikarâm*, the *Kalittohai*, and the *Pattuppâttu* would certainly not have long survived without his commentaries; and it is a question whether there are works of greater importance or of more absorbing interest than these in Tamil literature. An earnest scholar will seek in vain in the poems of more modern times for true poetry or a finished style, for pure language or natural descriptions. Morbid imagination and pedantic language characterise many of the more modern works. If the classical works had failed to obtain the help which immortalised them, the true poetic spirit and the love for naturalness of language would have long ago given way to a vitiated poetic taste and literary affectation; and these evils would have become universal. Whence came the help by which the lights that burned but dimly were fanned

into flame? It came from Nacchinârkkiniyar, the celebrated commentator of the middle ages.

Commentaries did exist before Nacchinârkkiniyar. Nakkîrar had left behind him an excellent commentary on the *Iraiyanârahapporul*. Ilambûranar and Sênâvaraiyar had written commentaries on portions of the *Tolkâppiyam*, and Pêrâsiriyar, a brief commentary on the *Tirukkovaiyâr*. But, with Nacchinârkkiniyar the manner was altered, and the language changed. Nakkîrar's poetic diction was exchanged for a more prosaic one, better adapted for commentaries. Ilambûranar's system of insufficient annotation was considerably improved. Sênâvaraiyar's ultra-grammatical phraseology made way for a flawless natural style; and Pêrâsiriyar's condensed and difficult form of writing was replaced by lucidity of expression and the use of quotations and illustrations. Thus a reform, if not a revolution, was brought about in the field of commentaries, and Nacchinârkkiniyar, as the leader of that reform, should rightly arrest our attention in a survey of the history of Tamil literature.

The field in which Nacchinârkkiniyar introduced his reform was a limited one; and therefore the interest he aroused was nothing compared with the effects of reforms in the sphere of religion. The reforms inaugurated by Mânikkavâchaka and Jnânasambandha astonished the illiterate and instructed the learned, but the influence of Nacchinârkkiniyar's reform was confined to closets of pandits. As, however, the community that responded to the influence of the commentator formed the flower of the Tamil people, Nacchinârkkiniyar is as much deserving of study as the other reformers. One important result of the limitation of his field of work is that no inscription mentions his name, and no *purânam* records the history of his life. The former of these facts may be a matter for regret, though the latter is not. *Purânam* means a series of hyperbolical conceits, very often having the name of the hero only as a reality. Such biographies are worse than nothing, and their non-existence should be a matter for joy. What, then, are the materials on which some account of his life can be based? There are his own commentaries, the monuments of his genius and industry, scattered eulogiums, and current traditions.

The little that is known about the personal life of Nacchinârkkiniyar we gather chiefly from a eulogium* on his commentary, which was composed probably by

* *Pattupâttu*, page 374.

a contemporary.* The purity of the language and the nature of the style warrant us in ascribing the stanza to the age of Nacchinârkkiniyar and in presupposing a personal acquaintance with him on the part of the writer of the eulogium. According to this stanza, Nacchinârkkiniyar was born of a Brahman family at Madura, then the capital of the Pândiyan kingdom. From the same source we learn that he belonged to the Bhâradvâja Gotram of the Brahman community, and that he was a Saivite in religion, which as well as the question of his date will be taken up for discussion later on. Here in passing we would venture the conjecture that Nacchinârkkiniyar must have reached the age of a hundred when he died. This conjecture rests solely but justly on the nature and extent of the work he left behind. Considering the immensity and thoroughness of this work, we cannot be far wrong in concluding that he must have devoted more than half a century to the acquisition of his profound knowledge of the world and of Tamil literature; and when we take account of the time which he must have spent in writing his commentaries, we see that he must have lived to a great age.

In religion Nacchinârkkiniyar was unquestionably a Saivite. This is supported by the eulogium already referred to. Nevertheless, there is a tendency among some modern scholars to hold that Nacchinârkkiniyar was a Jain. It will be time, however, to examine the arguments of such scholars when they state them; and meanwhile I shall state the argument for the other view. Taking the eulogium first, we may translate the lines† that have special reference to Nacchinârkkiniyar's religion thus: "He, of nature made in the likeness of that of the Wisdom-resplendent Siva pervaded by Knowledge Pure, the Sacred End arrived at by the Four Vedas." Now, a panegyric in such terms cannot be aspired to by any Saivite of ordinary distinction, and the dialect of the composition shows that it must have been the work of a person of superior culture. These lines, however, must not make us believe that Nacchinârkkiniyar was a saint. What he did within the short span of his human existence was almost miraculous; and therefore the praise accorded to him is just enough. But the question of praise it-

* Pandit Swaminatha Aiyar, in his introduction to the *Chintâmani*, definitely asserts that the learned authors of the eulogiums were contemporaries of the commentator.

† நான்மறை துணிந்த நற்பொரு ளாகிய
தூய ஞான நிறைந்த சிவச்சுடர்
தானே யாகிய தன்மை யாளன்.

self is not from our point of view so important as the statement that "Nacchinârkkiniyar was a Saivite"

Dr. Bower, in the introduction to his edition of the *Chintâmani*, Nâmahal Ilambakam, has remarked, "The commentator on *Chintâmani* called Nacchinârkkiniyar is supposed to have been a Saiva Brahman of the Madura District." It should be noted in this connection that Dr. Bower was greatly assisted in preparing the edition of the *Chintâmani* by one Sástram Aiyar, who, according to Dr. Bower himself, was "perhaps one of the best of eminent Tamil scholars amongst the few surviving Jains." Now, if there was any shadow of a doubt about Nacchinârkkiniyar's religion, is it not likely that the Jain pandit would have informed Dr. Bower of the possibility of the commentator's creed having been other than Saivite? The late Mr. Sundaram Pillai actually believed that Nacchinârkkiniyar was a learned Saiva commentator.* Mr. C. W. Damodaram Pillai, in his introduction to the *Virasoliyam*, remarks that although Nacchinârkkiniyar embraced the Saiva faith later on, he was a Jain in his younger days.† The author of the *Galaxy of Tamil Poets*, probably following this veteran scholar, proclaims the same view.‡ But nothing seems to warrant this assertion. Pandit Swaminatha Aiyar, who has shown in his editions a better acquaintance with Nacchinârkkiniyar's life and the current traditions about him, has omitted this point, although his editions appeared many years later than the works of the other two editors. If the tradition about the *Chintâmani* commentary that it is a rewritten one is true, we may perhaps hold that Nacchinârkkiniyar's more intimate knowledge of the Jain system acquired for the rewriting of it converted him to the Jain faith. But he certainly was never converted to the Saiva religion. Independently of this question of conversion, however, the testimony of these three scholars is valuable as throwing some light on the question of his religion.

Considering the matter more closely, we may observe that the very name of the commentator denotes that he was a Saiva. This view finds support in a verse§ in the *Dêvâram* of Tirunâvukkarasar, where the saint actually refers to Siva as Nacchinârkkiniyar.

* *Madras Christian College Magazine*, March 1891: 'The Ten Tamil Idyls.'—I., page 664.

† Page 19.

‡ *The Galaxy of Tamil Poets*, by J. R. Arnold of Jaffna, page 191.

§ Sthalamurai, Part II. page 79.

Srî Sivajnâna Yogi, in his *Kânchipurânam*,* addresses Siva as Nacchinârkkiniyây. The latter argument may be rejected on the ground that the author of the *Kânchipurânam* lived in a comparatively later age; but the former cannot be so easily thrust aside, being the utterance of one who lived two centuries earlier than Nacchinârkkiniyar. And both together suggest the idea that the name is very likely one of the many that go to make up the Sivasahasranâman in Tamil, and therefore also the conclusion that Nacchinârkkiniyar was a Saiva Brahman.

His commentaries also give unmistakable evidence in favour of this view. With the single exception of the *Chintâmani*, all the works he chose to comment upon are Saivite in their origin. Even the *Chintâmani* he selected for its sublime moral teachings and highly imaginative descriptions; and the author of it was no bigoted Jain. Tiruttakka Dêvar, for that is his name, makes reference to the exploits of Siva twice† in his work, and, on both occasions, to illustrate his points. In a stanza‡ in the Nâmahal Ilambakam he refers to Siva as having in his throat the Sâma Gîta. The commentator explains the previous stanzas by introducing apt quotations from the *Tiruvâchakam*; and in his commentary on the last of these he refutes an interpretation which makes the person who has the Sâma Gîta in his throat Jîvaka (hero) himself, and says it should refer only to Siva. In the whole of the *Chintâmani* commentary, Mânikkavâchaka's utterances are found freely quoted, I mean, his *Tiruvâchakam* as well as his *Tirukkovaiyâr*. When we come to Nacchinârkkiniyar's other commentaries, however, the case is different. In the *Tolkâppiyam*,§ the *Pattupâttu*‖ and the *Kalittohai*,¶ he leaves no room for discussion. He distinctly proclaims, though not in so many words, that his creed is Saivism. He adores, in a manner that would shame the staunchest Saivite, the Hindu sages of yore, and, coming to talk of the holy men of later times, he fails not in paying them due homage. Why doubt we, then, that he was

* Sattatânappadalam, stanza 11.

† Gunamâlaiyar Ilambakam, stanza 291. Namahal Ilambakam, stanza 3. See also Suramanjariyar Ilambakam, stanza, 44.

‡ Stanza 341 and commentary.

§ *Tolkâppiyam*, Eluttu. Evidence found in the use of the words 'Tirucchitrambalam' and 'Perumpatrappuliyûr,' according to Mr. Swaminatha Aiyar. *Tolkâppiyam* Porul, pp. 198, 673.

‖ Pages, 17, 20, 40, 339.

¶ The book contains many references to Siva, and so necessarily does the commentary.

a steady follower of the Saiva faith? If the Puranic accounts of Agastya or Muruba, as given by the commentator, differ in some important particulars from the accounts now generally accepted, that need not suggest that his religion was not Saivism. It need only suggest that the source was different from which he drew his stories. Because Nacchinârkkiniyâr wrote a commentary on the *Chintâmani*, a Jain work it does not follow that he was a Jain. If so, Pandit, Swaminatha Aiyar, the commentator of the *Manimêkhalai*, a Buddhistic work, should be a Buddhist.

Having satisfied ourselves that Nacchinârkkiniyar was a Saiva Brahman, we next proceed to ascertain the age in which he flourished and produced his works, which are among the noblest heritage of the Tamilians. A few years ago, no attempt at fixing his date could have been successful, in view of the meagre knowledge of his career which we possess apart from his commentaries. But the problem has now been rendered much easier by the discovery of more than one important date, in the literary history of Southern India, though the chronology of Tamil literature is always a difficult question.

It is accepted on all hands that Nacchinârkkiniyar belonged to the Jaina period or cycle of Tamil literature. According to Dr. Caldwell,* "the Jaina period extended probably from the eighth or ninth century A.D., to the twelfth or thirteenth." Thus Dr. Caldwell would place the commentator in any case later than the ninth century. But his conjecture regarding the beginning and end of the Jaina period evidently contradicts facts found in the Tamil classics. If we set any value at all on their testimony, Jain supremacy must be regarded as having commenced at so early a date as the fourth century or the fifth. In his edition† of the *Chintâmani*, Dr. Bower, after stating that Tiruttakka Dêvar probably lived not more than seven or eight hundred years ago, remarks that Nacchinârkkiniyar also probably lived not long after the writer of the *Chintâmani*. That would bring him down to the thirteenth century or even to the fourteenth. Dr. Bower also confirms Dr. Caldwell's opinion about the commencement of the Jaina period by quoting from Wilson a certain passage which runs as follows: "The Jains did not form a distinct and influential body until the 8th or 9th century after Christ." But these two opinions are mere assertions made at a time when comparatively litte was known concerning the history of South India.

Passing on to the opinions of native scholars, we find that Mr. Damodaram Pillai has more than once in his editions of Tamil classics expressed an opinion about the age of Nacchinârkkiniyar. In his editorial introduction to the *Vîrasolium*, where he has made a very praiseworthy attempt to give a sketch of the history of Tamil literature, he states that the Jaina cycle began with the second century and lasted for nearly three hundred years.* This cannot, however, be altogether true, inasmuch as there is evidence to prove that the Jain influence was at its height during the time of Tirujnânasambandha, in the early part of the seventh century A D. In the paragraph which deals with the question of the Jaina cycle, Mr. Damodaram Pillai introduces Nacchinârkkiniyar as one who, originally of the Jain persuasion, became a Saivite, and as one who wrote excellent commentaries on many classical works.† Immediately afterwards he adds, referring to the general idea of the paragraph, that he does not mean to say that all Tamil works written by Jains were written within the period specified. Perhaps he thought of including the commentator under the writers of the Itihasa age, which occupied the next eight hundred years, though in his introduction to the *Kalittohai*,‡ he definitely states that, as Nacchinârkkiniyar belongs to the age of the Jains, it is at least twelve centuries since he wrote this commentary (on the *Kalittohai*). This statement, it may be noted, is incompatible with the statement he makes in the introduction to the *Vîrasolium* regarding the period during which Jain influence was predominant. He says further: "The commentator who has not scrupled to cite from such later works as *Jîvakachintâmani* as well as from the works that have received the *imprimatur* of the Sangham, does not even take the name of Bhâratam or Râmâyanam or Kandapurânam where examples are found only in plenty. This clearly shows that all these works belong to a period more recent than Nacchinârkkiniyar's." Pretty much the same is what he says in his introduction to the *Tolkâppiyam* Poruladhikâram.§ We ourselves have arrived at the same conclusion, but, as will be seen on grounds quite different from these.

* *A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages*, Introduction, page 129.

† Introduction.

* Page 18.

† Page 19.

‡ Page 22.

§ Page 4.

Mr. Sundaram Pillai in his first article on 'The Ten Tamil Idyls' says: "The commentator (Nacchinârkkiniyar) remarks that this (Tiruvâvinaukudi) is the ancient name of the place which, in the days of Auvaiyâr came to be called Chittanvâlvu—a testimony of great value as showing the long interval that must have elapsed between Nakkîrar and Auvaiyâr who is reckoned, by Dr. Caldwell himself as a contemporary of Kamban and is placed therefore in the twelth century."* This view is however, based on the mistaken supposition that the Auvaiyâr of Kamban's time is the Auvaiyâr mentioned by Nacchinârkkiniyar.

In this connection we feel called upon to say a word about the age of Auvaiyâr, perhaps the most puzzling character among the Tamil celebrities that have arisen in South India since the days of Agastya. In the first place it must be remembered that the word 'Auvaiyâr' in popular language signifies a very old woman well versed in practical wisdom. Now, the Auvaiyâr of Kamban's time cannot, according to the generality of Tamil pandits, be identified with the Auvaiyâr who is said to have flourished in the Sangham age or with the Ganapati-Bhakta who, in the language of the tradition, ascended to heaven with Sundaramûrti, the last of the three Dêvâra hymn writers, and Sêramânperumâl, the reputed Saint of the Chera Kingdom. A tradition has it that Auvai managed to live so long as she did—nearly two hundred and forty years—by receiving a fruit (*nelli kani*) from Pandan, a Vaisya of Kâviripppûmpattinam, who gave it to the poetess, and was in turn immortalised by an *antâdi* known as *Pantanantâdi*. This Vaisya had gone to the lower world and had returned with nectar and the fruit. The tradition is found quoted in a footnote to a commentary on the *Kural*† in A'rumukhanâvalar's edition. The quotation, however, is a blunder, inasmuch as we know that the incident, which Parimêlalahar refers to, is not this but another, found in the older classics. This Auvaiyâr cannot be identified with the Auvaiyâr of Sundara's period, although she was very likely the woman who flourished at the same time as Kamban and others. Neither can she be identified with the writer whose stanzas Nacchinârkkiniyar quotes in his commentaries.

Now as to the other Auvaiyâr. She is the reputed authoress of many ethical works studied by the young of this country, and her connection with the Sangham is supported by traditions and classical works. Apart from Nacchinârkkiniyar's quoting from the *Konraivêndan* and other works of Auvaiyâr, the author of the *Silappadhikâram** of the second century has quoted from her *Mûturai*. Besides, she has left many stanzas linked with those of other poets in the *Purananûru*, a collection professedly of the Sangham age. The king Adhikan, who gave her the *nelli* fruit, is described in the *Pattupâttu*† as a *vallal*, a man of great liberality, and the incident itself is clearly referred to. We learn from the *Pattupâttu*, as well as from the *Purananûru*,‡ where the poetess herself alludes to the incident when praising the king, that the fruit has the property of extending one's lifetime to an enormous length, and that it can be obtained only from a beautiful tree to be found in certain secluded parts of the mountain regions. Nacchinârkkiniyar, in his commentary on the *Pattupâttu*, mentions the fruit, which is also frequently referred to in the Siddha Sâstras.

Again, Mr. Sundaram Pillai says: "It is interesting to note that Nacchinârkkiniyar, the learned Saiva commentator, quotes not a line from Sambandhar, in any of his elaborate annotations, while he scruples not to enforce his remarks by apt citations from Mânikkavâchakar, who, too, seems to have lived after the Madura College had become extinct. It is obvious, therefore, that in the days of Nacchinârkkiniyar, Sambandhar's usage had not been sufficiently old to be authoritative."§ The use of the word 'old' here is a little difficult to understand. Does this statement not seem inconsistent with what was said in the passage just examined? If Auvaiyâr's usage, the usage of one who, according to Mr. Sundaram Pillai, belongs to the twelfth century, could be authoritative, how could the usage of Sambandha, whom he considered to be rightly placed in the sixth century or the seventh, have failed to become authoritative? Probably he did not anticipate the passage already quoted, when he wrote this. This passage would seem to imply that Nacchinârkkiniyar and Sambandha were very nearly contemporaries, otherwise Mr. Sundaram Pillai's statement becomes inexplicable. While he himself admits that Sambandha attained to great

* *Madras Christian College Magazine*, March 1891, page 670.

† *Kural*, 100.

* Page 434.

† Sirupânarruppadai, ll. 100-103.

‡ Stanza 91.

§ *Madras Christian College Magazine*, March 1891, page 664.

celebrity, in the seventh century, such celebrity as induced the great Sankara of the eighth century, whose acquaintance with Tamil was obviously scanty, to refer to the saint's name in his *Saundarya Lahari* (a Sanskrit work) with sincere veneration, how could the saint's greatness have escaped our commentator's wide and extensive knowledge ? Not only so, Sambandha is avowedly referred to as a great saint in the hymns of Sundara and in the poems of Pattanattu Pillai, who probably belonged to the ninth century. Tirunâvukkarasar himself, an elder contemporary of Sambandha, speaks of the latter with much regard; and by the close of the tenth century all these Dêvâra hymn writers were being worshipped in the public temples, patronised by Râjarâja Chola and his successors.

This is the place also to note another erroneous statement of fact to which Mr. Sundaram Pillai has given currency* in his first article on 'The Ten Tamil Idyls.' He writes : "The classical commentator, Nacchinârkkiniyar, seeks to justify the author of the tenth Idyl against a criticism of one Alavanda Pillai A'siriyar, which is but one of the accepted and well-known names of Sambandha."† This evidently is an unconscious misrepresentation of truth. Sambandha, we know, is called by the name of A'ludaya Pillai. not A'lavanda Pillai. A'lavanda Pillai A'siriyar may be the A'lavandâr, the alleged author of the *Jñâna Vâsishtam*, a beautiful allegorical work illustrating sublime truths by means of pleasant stories. We know that Sambandha never commented on any classical work. Of A'lavandâr, however, a tradition is still prevalent at Madura that he was the rightful heir to the Zemindary of Veerakeralampûdar, and that attempts having been made to poison him, he got tired of worldly life and turned ascetic. The tradition-tellers refer us in proof of this fact to his name, which signifies that he *came* to reign but never reigned.

In the introduction to his edition of the *Silappadhikâram*, Pandit Swaminatha Aiyar claims, though not with sufficient reason, more antiquity for Adiyârkkunallâr than for Nacchinârkkiniyar. "Nacchinârkkiniyar," he says, "should have lived only posterior to Adiyârkkunallâr in so far as he has controverted many opinions that are found to be Adiyârkkunallâr's." Mr. Seshagiri Sâstriyar in his Report on a Search for Sanskrit and Tamil MSS. for the year 1896-1897, No. I, refutes Mr. Swaminatha Aiyar's view thus : "As the work (*Divâkaram*) is quoted by Adiyârkkunallâr in his commentary of the *Silappadhikâram*, the author must be anterior to Adiyârkkunallâr. If the opinion of Mr. Swaminatha Aiyar, the editor of the *Silppadhikâram*, viz., that Adiyârkkunallâr lived before Nacchinârkkiniyar, be correct, then the author of the lexicon under notice must be anterior to Nacchinârkkiniyar also. But it should be noted that the latter has, so far as I have known, not quoted the work under notice."* This surely is not an answer to Mr. Swaminatha Aiyar. Nacchinârkkiniyar does, as a matter of fact, quote from the *Divâkaram* more than once ;† and, even if we set him aside, Pêrâsiriyar an older commentator, has quoted from it in his commentary on the *Tirukkovaiyâr*. The other part of his reply, besides suggesting the probable date of Adiyârkkunallâr, is somewhat more reasonable. He says : "The work under notice (*Dandiyalankarâm*) is quoted by Adiyârkkunallâr in his commentary of the *Silappadhikâram*. But as it is not quoted by Nacchinârkkiniyar in any one of his commentaries, we may infer that the author of the work might be posterior to Nacchinârkkiniyar and prior to Adiyâkkunallâr."‡ This argument we acknowledge, is borne out by facts. But we should never adduce this as positive evidence in determining the relative ages of Adiyârkkunallâr and Nacchinârkkiniyar. The fact that the author of a book makes no reference to another author does not prove the impossibility of their contemporaneous existence. Milton in English literature betrays no signs of having ever heard of Jeremy Taylor and Jeremy Taylor betrays no signs of having ever heard of Milton. Yet these two were contemporaries, one the greatest poet and the other the greatest prose writer of his age.

The *Dandiyalankâram* determines the age of Adiyârkkunallâr rather than the relative ages of Adiyârkkunallar and Nacchinarkkiniyar. Tradition makes the author of the *Dandiyalankaram*, the son of Ambikapati, who was the son of Kamban, the great epic poet of the eleventh century. The author himself seems to have made reference to Anapâya Chola, and Anapâyan, according to Dr. Hultzsch, is a designation of Ko-Rajakêsarivarman *alias* Kulottunga Chola

* See *Jnana Bodhini*, Vol. I. Book vii, page 245, V. Sundaram Aiyar's article on *Patinenkilkkanakku*. The eighteen didactic pieces in Tamil.

† *Madras Christian College Magazine* March 1891, p. 665.

* Pages 35 and 36.

† *Pattupâttu*, page 15, and, probably, p. 216.

‡ Report, page 37.

Dèva.* The earliest king of that name having reigned only in the latter part of the eleventh century, Dandi could not have flourished earlier than the eleventh century. This work, then, fixes the upper limit of Adiyârkkunallâr's age to be the early years of the twelfth century A. D Another fact, namely that he has quoted from the *Kalingattu Parani*, corroborates this statement. The hero of that poem is Kulotunga Chola Deva I., who reigned from A.D. 1070 to A.D. 1118, as pointed out by Mr. Kanagasabhai Pillai and Dr. Fleet,† and its author therefore, must be placed in the earlier part of the twelfth century. This would indicate that the age of Adiyârkkunallâr was the latter part of the twelfth century. But there is not a single fact to guide us in determining exactly the lower limit of his age, except perhrps his extraordinary acquaintance with the Tamil classics. A comparison of the commentaries of Nacchinarkkiniyar with Adiyárkkunallàr's, however, leads us to some definite conclusion about the relative ages of this two commentators. Adiyarkkunallar quotes some *sutras* concerning *yogângas* (limbs of *yoga*) in his commentary on the *silappadhikâram*‡ when he comes to explain the nature of the domestic life and the life of an assetic. These *sutras* are also found in Nacchinarkkiniyar's commentary on the *Tolkappiyam*,§ but with a qualification Adiyarkkunallar quotes the *sutras* and leaves them with the remark: "Such are the *sutras*." Nacchiarkkiniyar does more. He says they are *urai-sutras* (commentary-*sutras*) that is, *sutras* especially prepared by the commentator to explain certain points in the commentary. This meaning of the expression '*urai-sutra* we get from the authors of the *Ilakkanakkottu*,|| and the *Prayôgavivêka*,¶ who have coined new *sutras* in their commentaries and said that such *sutras* pass under the name of *urai-sutras*.

With this explanation, then, we have reason to conclude that the *sutras* quoted by Nacchinarkkiniyar are, in all probability, his own, and that, therefore when Adiyarkkunallar quotes these *sutras*, he quotes from Nacchinarkkiniyar. Thus we see that we are not justified in placing Nacchinarkkiniyar even in the twelfth century.

Before proceeding to ascertain when Nacchinarkkiniyar actually lived, let us find out when he cannot have lived. It is an accepted fact that Pérâsiriyar, the famous commentator of the *Tirukkovaiyár*, of Manikkavachakar, is older than Nacchinarkkiniyar. Had not Pérâsiriyar written a commentary on the *Tirukkovaiyâr*, we should be led from his pure and elvated style to conclude that he lived not long after the extinction of the Sangham. But his commentary on the *Tirukkovaiyâr* forms positive evidence that he lived posterior to the author of *The Sacred Word*. His priority to Nacchinârkkiniyar is easily proved. In his commentary on *Tolkâppiyam* the latter refers many times to Pêrâsiriyar's commentaries. From Nacchinârkkiniyar we learn that Pêrasiriyar wrote a commentary on the *Tolkâppiyam** as well as one on the *Kuruntohai*; † and this fact is confirmed by traditions and extant stanzas. About the commentary on the *Tirukkovaiyar* itself, there was until very recently a difference of opinion among pandits, the majority attributing it to Nacchinârkkiniyar, while a scattered few held that it was written by Pêrâsiriyar. But now there is no doubt about the authorship of the commentary. Subrahmanya Dîkshitar, the author of *Prayoga Viveka*, has pointed out in his work more than once that the commentator of the *Tirukkovâiyar* was Pêrâsiriyar; and Mailêrumperumal Pillai, the reputed *vidvân* of Tinnevelly, whose priority to Dîkshitar is undeniable, has referred in his *Kalládam* commentary to points found in the printed commentary on the *Tirukkovaiyâr* refers of course under the title 'The Commentary of Pêrâsiriyar'. Kunrattûr Chokkappa Nâvalar, in his commentary on the *Tañjaivánankovai*, refers to this commentary of Pèrâsiriyar. Mr. Swaminatha Aiyar says that in the manuscripts he chanced to find in the houses of hereditary pandits in the southern districts, the top bear the words 'The Commentary of Pêrâsiriyar', and that on careful examination, he discovered that the manuscripts contained neither more nor less than the printed copy which was erroneously attributed to Nacchinârkkiniyar, not only by the editor, Arumukhanâvalar, but by all of the then renowned pandits who have appended enlogistic poems to the edition of the *Tirukkovaiyâr*.

Having thus seen that the commentary on the *Tirukkovaiyar* is Pêrásiriyar's and that he lived before Nacchinárkkiniyar, let us examine this commentary to see if it can enlighten us as to the date of Pêrâsiriyar and eventually therefore as to the date of

* *South-Indian Inscriptions*, Vol II. Part ii. page 153.
† *Ibid.* Vol. II. Part ii. page 230.
‡ Page 327.
§ Page. 165.
|| Page 15.
¶ Page 2.

* *Tolkâppiyam*, Poruladhikaram, p. 230.
† *Ibid* p. 89.

Nacchinàrkkiniyar. On page 113 of the commentary we read to our intense delight a quoted stanza which we guess to be a *devaram*; and our delight is made more intense when we find the very same stanza at the top of a page * in the *Devara-sthalamurai.* We at once conclude that Pêrâsiriyar must have lived after the particular saint from whom emanated this, to us interesting, hymn. And who was that saint but Tirunâvukkarasar, the prince of poets?

Now, if we could ascertain the date of Tirunâvukkarasar, we might regard Pêrâsiriyar's date as having been almost fixed. Fortunately, the date of Tirunavukkarasar, or Jñaansambandha, his younger contemporary, is no longer a matter for dispute, but a veritable historical fact—at any rate as well established as any fact yet known in the history of South India. In his article on 'The Early History of Southern India',† Mr. Venkayya gives in the arguments which lead us to this undisputed conclusion. He says: "According to the Periya Purânam, a Tamil work which gives an account of the sixty-three devotees of Siva and whose historical value has been proved to be very great, Siruttonda, one of the devotees, who was a military man, 'reduced to dust the old city of Vâtâpi' for his master, whose name is not given, but who must have been the Pallava King Narasimhavarman I. Siruttonda was a contemporary of the great Saiva devotee Tirujñânasambandhar, and is referred to by the latter in one of his hymns. Thus Tirujñànasambandar was a contemporary of the Pallava King Narasimhavarman I. A comparison of the life of another devotee, *viz.*, Tirunàvukkaraiyar or Appar, who was another contemporary of Tirujñânasambandhar, with the two Trichinopoly cave inscriptions published by Dr. Hultzsch, will convince you that Appar must have lived under the Pallva King Gunabhara, who was probably identical with Mahendravarman I., the father of Narasimhavarman I. From these facts we conclude that the two famous Saiva devotees, Appar and Sambandhar, lived about the middle of the seventh century A. D., as the Pallava King, Narasimhavarman I., was shown to have been a contemporary of the Western Chalukya, Pulikêsin II., whose dates range from 609 to 642 A.D." The date of Tirunavukkarasar being ascertained to be the middle of the seventn century A.D., Perasiriyar must be sought for in the latter part of the same century, or more probably in the earlier part of the next. Thus as an upper limit to the age of Nacchinarkkiniyar we have the early years of the eighth centnry A D.

S. Anavaratavinayakam Pillai, M.A.

(*To be continued.*)

* Part- 111 page 331.

† *Madras Christian College Magazine*, January 1896.

A LIBRARY OF ADVAITA WORKS.

Mr. Sambasiva Aiyar, Manager of the Sri Vidya Press, Kumbakonam, has been engaged for some time in bringing out a collection of valuable *Advaita* works in Sanskrit, written by such eminent authorities as Brahmânanda Sarasvati, Madhusûdana Sarasvati, Appaya Dîkshita and others. A few of these, for instance, the Laghuchandrika and the Brahma-Vidyâbharana, were known by repute merely, till Mr. Sambasiva Aiyar conceived the idea of publishing them. The subject-matter of the eight volumes now comprising the series together with remarks regarding their authors will be found briefly set forth in the prefatory note, appended below, from the pen of our well-known countryman, Mr. Sashiah Sastriar, C. S. I., late Dewan of Pudukotta, to which I have added a few footnotes which may be of some interest to bibliophiles. The whole collection is an exceedingly valuable one and it is only to be regretted that the publisher has not met with the only reward due to his unselfish labour, viz., an appreciative reception and an encouraging sale of the books. Though he has invested a goodly portion of his heritage in this, a labour of love for him, he expects and desires no profits, but would be amply satisfied and incited to further services in the same direction, if he can only recover his outlay by the encouragement of the learned and the wealthy of the land. I need not add any more to what has been written with such exceeding clearness by Mr. Sashiah Sastriar.

M. Narayanaswami Iyer.

ENGLISH PREFACE TO THE ADVAITA MANJARI.

1. The Advaita Manjari or series of treatises on the Advaita Philosophy consists of Eight Volumes (Royal Octavo) printed and published in Devanagari character at the Sri Vidya Press, Kumbhakonam by Sambasiva Ariya of Konerirajapuram.

(*a*) The first of them is Advaita Siddhi, pages 345, grandhas 10,000, priced Rs. 4—8—0.

(*b*) The second is Laghuchandrikâ, otherwise called Gauda Brahmânandiyam, pages 655, grandhas 20,000 priced Rs. 7—8—0.

(*c*) The third is Siddhântabindu.

(*d*) The fourth is Nyâyaratnâvali. These last two are printed together as one Volume, pages 260, grandhas 6,000, priced Rs. 3—0—0.

(*e*) The fifth is Sûtra Vritti, pages 140, grandhas 4,000, priced Rs. 1—8—0.

(*f*) The sixth is Siddhântalesasangraham, pages 485, grandhas 14,000, priced Rs. 5—0—0.

(*g*) The seventh is Brahma Vidyâbharanam, pages 840, grandhas 24,000, priced Rs. 10—0—0.

(*h*) The eighth is Sivatatva Vivekam, pages 142, grandhas 5000, priced Rs. 2—0—0.

2. Thus the 7 volumes comprising the 8 works contain pages 2867 and grandhas 83,000, priced Rs. 33—8—0. They are called *Manjari*, because they all relate to the same subject;—but practically they are all separate independent works by separate authors which have appeared at long intervals. Though they are well-known to scholars as works of authority, they have been never printed and published before and have been very rare to be had in a correct or complete form. Much credit is due to the enterprizing publisher for collecting and publishing them at his own cost and making them accessible to scholars and to the public generally; unfortunately, he has not met with that degree of encouragement which was commensurate with his labours and with the intrinsic value of the works themselves. This in a great measure has been probably due to measures not having been taken to give them wide publicity and probably to some extent to the difficult and intricate character of the subject itself. They are now re-introduced to the public in the hope that their high merits will be appreciated and that they will find ready purchasers among such of our enlightened and patriotic countrymen as can well afford to patronize them.

3. After these preliminary remarks, it is but appropriate and necessary that a brief outline account should be given of each of the treatises for the information of those who may not be already conversant with them. They will now be accordingly described in the order in which they have been already enumerated.

A. Advaita Siddhi[1] is an original work by Madhusûdana Saraswati. It is a commentary on S'ankara Bâshyam—the famous gloss on the Vyâsa Sûtras and is said to have been written about 300 years ago. It is a refutation of the Dvaita doctrine propounded by Vyâsârayar in his famous work known as Nyâyâmritam. It was answered by a work called Tarangani by a Dvaita author. Tarangani was answered by Gauda Brahmânandîyam otherwise called Laghuchandrikâ, which in its turn elicited Vanamâla Misrîyam. This awain was atswered by Triyambaka Sâstri of Mysore in a treatise called Advaita Siddhânta Vaijayanti.

The Advaita Siddhi is divided into four chapters called Parichchedams, each of which is again subdivided into minor heads or topics. In the first parichchedam the question of the world being mithyâ or not mithyâ (i. e. illusory or not illusory) as stated by both the parties, is stated under 54 heads or issues. In the second, A'tmanirûpanam or nature of Atma is discussed under 54 heads. In the third, the means of realizing union or absorption in the A'tma are described under 4 sub-heads, that is to say, S'ravanam, Mananam, Nidhidhyâsanam &c., In the fourth, Muktinirüpanam or what is Mukti or Moksham, is discussed under 6 such heads.

B. Laghuchandrikâ otherwise called Gauda Brahmânandîyam is a gloss by Brahmânanda Saraswati on Advaita Siddhi. In its sub-divisions and order of topics, it follows the Advaita Siddhi. It is a rejoinder to Tarangani which was an answer to Advaita Siddhi, No. A.

C. Siddhântabindu by Madhusûdana Saraswati is a Vyâkhyânam on the Das'a S'loki of S'ankara which is the essence of his doctrine in a very condensed form.

D. Niyâyaratnâvali is again a gloss on Siddhántabindu by the author of Laghuchandrikâ. These two treatises C and D are really abridgments of Advaita Siddhi and Laghuchandrikâ which were probably found much too voluminous for easy study.

E. Sütra Vritti is a work by a disciple of S'ankara and is a short simple, and literal paraphrase of the Vyàsa Sûtras. It is divided into four chapters or Adhyaya, in which the subjects of Jagatkàranam, criticism of opposing doctrines, moksha upâyam or means to moksha and moksha itself are treated in the same order as in the Sútras.

F. Siddhântalesa sangraham is an original work by Appayya Dîkshitar who is said to have lived 400 to 500 years ago. It is a review of all the doctrines of belief with the conclusion that Advaita is the soundest of them. This work also deals with the general subject in the same order which is observed in the other works—namely in four parichchedams—but more closely criticises the differences which had sprung up among the advaitis themselves in the long interval since s'ankara's Bhâshyam. The positions which he undertakes to substantiate are (1) that Nirguna Brahman is alone taught by Vedas (2) that Moksha is to be obtained by Vidyä or Jnänam (3) that by Jnänam is meant Brahmanjanam (4) that Moksha is the goal of all knowledge.—Achyuta Krishnananda Saraswati has written a gloss on this work.

G. Brahma Vidyâbharanam by Advaitânanda Saraswati is a commentary on S'ankara's sútra Bhâshyam. It is divided intofour Adhyayas, each having four Pàdas—

1. This appears to be a different treatise from that published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal in their *Bibliotheca Indica* and styled *Advaita Brahma Siddhi*.--N.

and the order in which the subjects are treated is the same as in 'Sútra Vritti.' It is a work which enjoys much celebrity among Vedantic students.

H. S'ivatatwa Vivekam is a work by Appayya Dikshitar in which his object is to establish that Saguna Brahman is no other than Parama Sivam or Isvara who is the controller of Mâyâprapancham or creation as it appears to us and that Nirguna Brahman eventually is attainable only through and after Saguna Brahman is realized.—This doctrine is broached in 60 Slokas called *Sikharinimala*, the Slokas being all in Sikharini metre. He has himself made a Vyâkhyânam or commentary on the Slokas.

4. It must not be supposed that these 8 works *exhaust* the treatises on Advaita. There are several other series which though more recent are also held in great esteem. One series for example is Váchaspatyam[2] by Váchaspati[1] Misra which is also a commentary on S'ankara's Sûtra Bhâshyam. It was followed by Kalpataru[3] a work by a sanyasin of Northern Circars or Telugu country and this again has evoked a Vyâkhya known as Parimalam[4] by Appayya Dîkshitar.—Another series consists of a commentary on S'ankara Sûtra Bhâshyam known as Panchapadika[5] which has elicited Vivaranam[6] and Tatvadîpikâ another work generally read is Ramânandíyam[7]—and also Anandagiriyam[8] both being commentaries on S'ankara Sútra Bhâshyam. Appayya Dîkshitar, who is reputed as the ablest and most prolific author of recent centuries has written a work called Nyâya Rakshâmani on the Sûtras themselves.—It was the ambition and intention of the publisher of the 8 works, eventually to edit and bring out several of them at least, if his present undertaking met with sufficient encouragement.

5. Maha Mahopadhyaya Brahma Sri Raju Sastrial who is the greatest sanskrit scholar living has borne testimony to the great and rare value of the 8 works now published, and to the correctness of them, other testimony is unnecessary.

6. It now only remains for me to exhort all the Maharajahs, Zemindars and other noblemen and all such of my countrymen as are possessed of the means to come forward and reward the labors of the compiler who out of pure love for his Country's Religion and Philosophy has sunk his fortune in it, not only by liberally subscribing for copies for themselves, but by persuading all friends within their reach to do so likewise.

KUMBAHKONAM, 1st Nov. 1897.

A. SASHIAH SASTRI, C. S. I.,
Fellow, Madras University, late Dewan of Travancore and late Dewan Regent of Pudukotai.

2. Published in the Bibliotheca Indica by Bala Sastri of Benares. It is called *Bhâmati*.—N.

3. By Amalananda. Published by E. J. Lazarus & Co., Benares, in the *Vizianagaram Sanskrit Series*.—N.

4. Published in the same series.—N.

5. By Padmapâda. *Viz. Sans. Series.*—N.

6. By Prakâsâtman. *Viz. Sans. Series.* This edition contains extracts from the *Tatvadîpikâ* and from another gloss styled *Bhâvaprakâsikà*.—N.

7. This has been printed in Madras in Telugu characters. It seems to be popular only in Southern India.—N.

8. Published in the *Anandasrama Sanskrit Series* of Mr. M. C. Apte of Poona. This is the best-known of all the glosses on Sankara's Bhashya. There is also another gloss by Govindananda called *Ratna Prabha*. This has appeared in the *Bibliotheca Indica*.—N.

EXTRACTS.

IT is necessary to the existence of our idea of beauty that the sensual pleasure, which may be its basis, should be accompanied first with joy, then with love of the object, then with the perception of kindness in a superior intelligence, finally, with thankfulness and veneration towards that intelligence itself, and as no idea can be at all considered as in any way an idea of beauty until it be made up of these emotions, any more than we can be said to have an idea of a letter of which we perceive the perfume and the fair writing, without understanding the contents of it; and as these emotions are in no way resultant from, nor obtainable by, any operation of the intellect; it is evident that the sensation of beauty is not sensual on the one hand, nor is it intellectual on the other, but is dependent on a pure, right and open state of the heart, both for its truth and for its intensity, insomuch that even the right after-action of the Intellect upon facts of beauty so apprehended, is dependent on the acuteness of the heart-feeling about them.—RUSKIN. (*Modern Painters.*)

NOW, therefore, I think that, without the risk of any farther serious objection occurring to you, I may state what I believe to be the truth—that beauty has been appointed by the deity to be one of the elements by which the human soul is continually sustained; it is therefore to be found more or less in all natural objects, but in order that we may not satiate ourselves with it, and weary of it, it is rarely granted to as in its utmost degrees. When we see it in those utmost degrees, we are attracted to it strongly and remember it long, as in the case of singularly beautiful scenery or a beautiful countenance. On the other hand, absolute ugliness is admitted as rarely as perfect beauty; but degrees of it, more or less distinct, are associated with whatever has the nature of death and sin just as beauty is associated with what has the nature of virtue and of life.

RUSKIN. (*Lectures on Architecture and Painting*).

AMONG the moral instincts of humanity none is more natural, more universal, or more insuperable, than prayer. The infant readily learns to pray; the old man has recourse to prayer as his refuge amid the solitude of his declining years. Prayer comes instinctively to the young lips which can scarce pronounce the name of God, and to the dying lips which have no longer strength to pronounce it. Among all nations, unknown and well-known, barbarous and civilized, one meets at every turn, the facts and formulas of prayer. Wherever man is found, in certain circumstances and at certain hours, under the influence of certain spiritual instincts, the eyes are raised, the hands are clasped, the knees are bent for the purpose of prayer or thanksgiving, adoration or supplication—GUIZOT.

Just Published, pages iii, 440, 8vo, cloth
Price Eighteen Shillings.

THE NALADIAR

OR

FOUR HUNDRED QUATRAINS IN TAMIL

WITH

Introduction, Translation and Notes, Critical, Philological and Explanatory

TO WHICH IS ADDED

A CONCORDANCE AND LEXICON

with Authorities from the oldest Tamil writers

BY THE

REV. G. U. POPE, M. A., D. D.,

Sometime Fellow of the Madras University, Member of the Royal Asiatic Society AND OF *the German Oriental Society.*

FIFTY COPIES HAVE BEEN PRINTED ON LARGE PAPER, FOR WHICH EARLY APPLICATION IS NECESSARY.
PRICE TWO POUNDS PER COPY.

Other Works

BY

THE REV. G. U. POPE, M. A., D. D.

FOURTH EDITION, MUCH ENLARGED. IN THREE PARTS.
TWELVE SHILLINGS AND SIX PENCE EACH.

A TAMIL HAND-BOOK

OR

Full Introduction to the Common Dialect of that Language.

PART I.

I. Introduction.
  1. History of the Language and Literature.
  2. Orthography, Pronunciation.
II. Grammatical, Lessons, Vocabularies and Exercises.
III. General Index.

PART II.

Appendices—Reading Lessons, Paradigms.
Notes on the Study of the 'Kural'.
Key to the Exercises.

PART III.

Dictionaries—
  I. Tamil-English.
  II. English-Tamil.

Siddhanta Deepika

ADVERTISING RATES.

THE JOURNAL HAS A CIRCULATION

Throughout India, and European Countries.

One insertion	Rs. 10 a page.
Two insertions	„ 15 „
Three „	„ 20 „
Six „	„ 36 „
Twelve „	„ 50 „

Octavo, 12 s.

THE SACRED KURAL OF TIRUVALLUVA-NAYANAR

WITH

Metrical Translation, Notes, Grammar, Lexion and Conordane.

Other Works

BY

THE REV. G. U. POPE, M. A., D. D.

Fifth Edition, Crown 8vo, price 7s. 6d.

First Lessons in Tamil

OR

An Introduction to the Common Dialect of that Language,
For the use of Foreigners learning Tamil, and of Tamilians learning English, with an easy Catechism in Tamil of both Colloquial and Classical Dialects. 5th Edition.

Ready for Sale.

SRI BHAGAVAD GITA.

With **Sri Ramanujacharya's** Commentary, Translated into English by A. GOVINDACHARLU, C. E., F. T. S.

Demy 8vo. 600pp.

(*a*) Full superior calico, gold lettered	Rs.	10 0 0
(*b*) Full calico, with printed title	...	9 0 0
(*c*) Full paper, with printed title	...	8 0 0

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

THE TABLE OF THE 32 UPANISHAD VIDYAS.

Printed on glazed card in colored ink ... Rs. 0 6 0

LECTURES ON INSPIRATION, INTUITION, & ECSTASY.

Part I (*Occidental*)	0 6 0
Part II (*Oriental*)	0 7 0
Part III *Theosophical*	0 5 0

Apply to :—**A. GOVINDACHARLU,** C. E. F. T. S.,
VEDA GRIHAM,
Mysore (India.)

The Viveka Chintamani,

Monthly Tamil Magazine and Review,

Subscription Yearly Rs. 4.

NO SUBSCRIPTION RECEIVED FOR PART OF A VOLUME,
Volume begins May of each year and ends with April.

Gospel of Buddha

By

DR. PAUL CARUS,

Revised Edition Rupees **1—12—0**
By V. P. P. *Rs.* **1—14—0**

Only a few copies on hand.

APPLY SHARP TO—
C. V. SWAMINATHA IAYAR,
Secretary, D. K. Agency,
Triplicane, Madras.

Most Important Notice.

JUST PUBLISHED
A
Table of Tatwas.

Exhibiting in full and accurutely

IN THE FORM OF PRANAVA

THE SAGUNA
AND THE NIRGUNA
AND THE ATYASRAMA
AND THE SIDDHANTA IDEALS.

with Full references.

Price Rupee One. Postage ½ anna.

APPLY TO :—

THE PUBLISHER
SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA,
MADRAS.

SRI KASI VASI S. SENTHINATHIER.

Our Saints' Calendar.

நாயன்மார்கள் திருநக்ஷத்திரம்.

English Month.		The Names of saints.
July 1900.	1	Amarniti Nayanar
	2	Murti Nayanar Pugarcholar
	23	Kûtruvar
August.	1	Perumiralai Kurumbar
	2	St. SUNDARAR Seraman Perumal
	5	Kaliar Kotpuliar
	23	Pugartunaiar Adhipattar
	24	Ilayangudimarar
	25	Serutunaiyar
	26	Marai Gnana Sambandhar
	31	Kulachiraiar
September.	3	Kungiliyakalayar

PHOTOGRAPHS ! PHOTOGRAPHS !!

"Secure the shadow before the substance fades"

C. VARATHARAJULU & Co.,

ARTISTS AND PHOTOGRAPHERS,

69, *MALAYAPERUMAL STREET,*

ESPLANADE, MADRAS.

Photographs of all sizes and in all its latest permanent processes can be taken in our studio at moderate terms.

A TRIAL IS SOLICITED.

Views of the Southern India and Streesaila Parvad (The Kailasam) can be had.
8″ × 6″ per dozen Rs. 12.

One set of Streesailum views containing :—

The golden temple Streeparvad (The Kailasum) in 8 × 6. The golden vemana. The front gateway, the inner gateway. The sculptured wall. Pathala Gunga (the bathing-ghat). Chenchus. The temple tree with some Sanyasins. The Siva-Parvaty. The panorama of the Neel-gunga and the Krishna and Mahanandy cost only Rs. 5.

A single copy of the golden temple Streeparvad (the Kailasum) in 8 × 6 costs Rupee 1.

A single of Mahanandy in cabinet size costs Annas 8.

MADRAS :—Printed by P. C. Kalliana Sundara Nadar, at the C. N. Press, and Published by J. M. Nagarathnam.